

at our disposal—in these dealings between private individuals—the best means of securing both economic betterment and a just and lasting peace.

As the economic machinery of other countries around the world is developed or goes through processes of evolution and change, we must make it possible for them to adopt those portions of the American and Free World system of capital as are consistent with their own traditions and their own capabilities. We are leaders in a tremendous cause—the struggle of men everywhere to live without crushing want and to live in freedom. No tyranny in history has been able to crush this hope in the hearts of men. But it is unrealistic as well as dangerously shortsighted to assume that others will want to take over our entire way of life just at it has developed in this country, regardless of how well it may fit their particular needs at this particular period of their development. We must try to be advocates of our system, with emphasis on the benefits which flow to people—recognizing that the particular techniques which helped us achieve those benefits may have to be modified for use elsewhere.

When we look at our country in perspective, we are impressed with the fact that during the last 75 years we have built the most productive system in the world. When one analyzes why this is so, a great deal of attention must be paid to the process of growth and change resulting from the dynamic demand of people for more goods and for better ways to produce them. These demands are expressed in terms of research, technology, and incentives on the one hand, and in higher standards of living on the other. In the whole process of change and development, the constant conflict between liberty and controls continues.

The forces which have been responsible for the evolution and development of our economic system and its tremendous productive power are as vital today as ever before and beckon us to new horizons of accomplishment. There will always be problems with which we have to cope. A competitive economy with dependence upon myriad decisions and judgments will always incur the hazards of recession and inflation. We have learned a great deal about how to cope with them. We must always be endeavoring to learn more. This requires flexibility and a willingness to utilize our maximum competence and instrumentalities both as a people and as a Government to see that neither inflation or deflation should run a ruinous course.

We will always have the problem of providing the incentives for the formation of adequate capital and the education which will secure an adequate supply of skilled people. We will always be concerned with the complexities of cost and price and the consequent responsibilities that are attendant upon labor and management in order that we maintain a sound relationship in the public interest. We will eternally have with us the problem of maintaining our freedoms and avoiding regimentation.

Our faith in this country and our economic system is strong. We have become the greatest productive Nation in the world. Our distributive capacity has run somewhat behind and we must be sure that our ability to distribute both nationally and internationally matches stride with our productive ability.

We doubled our national output once every 24 years before World War II and once in 18 years since that time. The benefits of our growth are being shared on a widening basis. Individual and family income is on the rise. More than one-third of the Ameri-

can families earn in excess of \$5,000 per year. And, the Committee for Economic Development, in a recent report estimated that by 1975 the average family income after payment of taxes will amount to \$7,100 a year (in terms of dollars of 1956 purchasing power) and that by 1975 our gross national product may well exceed \$725 billion.

Today there is a new challenge and a new opportunity.

Our national population has doubled in 50 years. It is expanding at a rate of 3 million persons per year. The number of American workers is increasing at a rate of nearly 1 million per year. Millions of new workers will be needed to make, sell, and distribute our goods.

Looking at even broader figures, it took the world something like 5,000 years of recorded history to have the first billion people alive on this earth at one time. This occurred in 1830. It took us only a little over 100 years to have the second billion people alive at one time on this globe. By 1970 the world will have 3 billion inhabitants—and those 3 billion are the people whose wants and demands will make the economy of our country and the economy of the world.

These factors of growth bring us to the realization of the new demands that will be impressed upon our technology and our science; new obligations for educational opportunities and a higher quality of education. They emphasize the necessity for improving the national health; for utilizing all our ingenuity as individuals, business and Government to minimize fluctuations in our economy; to provide, in addition to material things, new cultural opportunities for people who have time to enjoy them.

The vistas of the future are as limitless as the capacity of our people. It belongs to the dynamic, to the imaginative, to those who are willing to work and compete.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1958

Rev. James W. Baar, First Reformed Church, Denver, Colo., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee for another day of grace and life. We are 1 day farther from our birth and 1 day closer to our death. Let this day count before Thee and before men, because we turn our backs on sin and turn to holiness and righteousness.

We pray for Thy mercy and favor upon each Senator and his family. In love provide every need for body and soul, for this life and for the life which is to come. In their sacred duty, use each one as a minister of God for good.

By Thy word and providence, direct the Senate work today, keep our beloved country, and bring all the nations to Thee. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 29, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11451) to authorize the construction and sale by the Federal Maritime Board of a superliner passenger vessel equivalent to the steamship *United States*, and a superliner passenger vessel for operation in the Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 308) to provide for the printing of additional copies of hearings on reciprocal trade agreements legislation, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 11451) to authorize the construction and sale by the Federal Maritime Board of a superliner passenger vessel equivalent to the steamship *United States*, and a superliner passenger vessel for operation in the Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Commit-

tee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. McCLELLAN, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today: The Veterans Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Railroad Retirement Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour, for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees. (For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Army will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frank W. Hull, of Washington, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 30, with headquarters at Seattle, Wash.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Walter R. Schreiber, of Maryland, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James L. Latimer, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 21, with headquarters at Port Arthur, Tex.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Douglas Butler, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Fred Elledge, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE REGULAR ARMY, THE NAVY, AND THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Regular Army

and in the Navy and in the Marine Corps, which had been laid on the Vice President's desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, all these nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1959—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (S. Doc. No. 94)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1959 involving an increase in the amount of \$1,802,000 for the Veterans' Administration and a proposed increase in a limitation for the Housing and Home Finance Agency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PROJECT PROPOSALS UNDER SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

Four letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, informing the Senate, pursuant to law, of the receipt of project proposals under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, in the States of California, Nevada, and Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to enact legislation changing the method of computing the basic pay for members of the Armed Forces of the United States

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States legislation, including S. 3081 and H. R. 9979 which would change the method of computing the basic pay for members of the Armed Forces in accordance with the recommendations of a special committee headed by Ralph J. Cordner, president of General Electric Co.; and

"Whereas the military forces need a means for attracting and retaining skilled personnel in order to maintain a deterrent

power for peace during these times of advancing technology and threat of aggression; and

"Whereas the Armed Forces do not have the means to compete for trained personnel urgently needed for the defense of this country, and a significant factor in their inability to do so is the inadequacy of the present compensation structure; and

"Whereas the proposed changes in military pay are based on merit rather than longevity, will bring military pay more in line with the pay standards of industry and will offer greater reenlistment incentive for highly trained personnel; and

"Whereas the program of the Cordner Committee, while making possible at least a 15 percent improvement in the combat capability of the United States Armed Forces, would by the year 1962, or sooner, result in savings and gains up to \$5 billion a year in the cost of national defense: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to revise the existing pay structure in the Armed Forces; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

OPERATION OF GLEN CANYON RESERVOIR—LETTER FROM GOVERNOR OF ARIZONA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Governor of the State of Arizona, transmitting a statement of the Arizona Interstate Stream Commission and the Arizona Power Authority, which indicates the reasons why the State of Arizona is unable to concur in the report of the Secretary of the Interior in regard to the operation of the Glen Canyon Reservoir, which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF DEPARTMENT OF AUDIO-VISUAL INSTRUCTION OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just received a resolution adopted at the 1958 convention of the Department of Audio-Visual Instruction in Minneapolis, in support of the Hill and Elliott bills.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Department of Audio-Visual Instruction of the National Education Association, in convention assembled, gives unanimous assent and support to the defense of education bills, particularly to the Hill bill S. 3187 and the Elliott bill H. R. 10381, providing Federal assistance for greater support of education and increased utilization of facilities for the improvement of instruction which will facilitate the implementation of DAVI objectives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That DAVI urge the active support of the Senate and House in the consideration and passage of these bills.

AMENDMENTS TO RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1509)

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported favorably, without amendment, the resolution (S. Res. 17) to amend section 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, together with individual views.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 3728. A bill to incorporate the Big Brothers of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 3729. A bill to provide for a program which will contribute to the national defense by encouraging the continuing operation of the iron mines in the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNAMARA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 3730. A bill to amend section 89 of title 28 of the United States Code in order to authorize holding terms of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida at Crestview, Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 3731. A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal office building in Kansas City, Mo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

INCORPORATION OF BIG BROTHERS OF AMERICA

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I have the pleasure at this time of introducing, for proper reference, a bill to provide a Federal charter for the Big Brothers of America. In my opinion, this organization is a tremendous force in opposition to juvenile delinquency. I have been associated with the organization for many years, and I had the high honor in 1955 of being selected the Big Brother of the Year. A Federal charter will be very helpful to this organization in the furtherance of its work with the young boys of our Nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3728) to incorporate the Big Brothers of America, introduced by

Mr. HENNINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENCOURAGEMENT FOR OPERATION OF IRON MINES

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to encourage the continuing operation of domestic iron mines in the interest of the national defense.

The bill would require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program under which iron-mine operators could keep their mines in operation and still realize a reasonable profit.

Under the proposed program, the operator would be paid an amount for each ton of iron ore which, together with the amount he would receive from the sale of the ore, would assure him this reasonable profit.

This is a new approach to a solution to our mineral problems.

I think legislation such as I propose here would serve as a vehicle to explore this vital problem and arrive at sane conclusions. The details of a reasonable program and cost factor, I am sure, would be developed through hearings on this bill.

In effect, this measure is a companion bill to S. 3630, which I introduced on April 17, and which would provide for the stockpiling of copper ore under the Strategic Materials Stockpiling Act.

Unlike copper, however, iron ore obviously is not adaptable to stockpiling and also it is not normally considered a strategic material.

But while its normal abundance bars the strategic classification, it is equally obvious that any threat to an adequate supply of iron ore would immediately create a critical situation.

Until 1947, iron ore production in the United States showed a long-range tendency to rise—while imports were kept at a generally stable and low level.

Prior to that year, imports rose above the 3-million-ton level only once. That was in 1929 when imports totaled 3,139,334 tons.

But in 1947, the import total jumped to 4,895,652 tons—and by 1957, imports totaled a staggering 33,653,048 tons.

It now appears that 30 to 40 percent of our iron ore needs will come from nondomestic sources by 1970.

There are many reasons for the turn-about in the historical pattern of iron ore supply. I will not discuss them here.

However, the problem is easily recognizable: Can we afford to permit our domestic mining industry to decline to a point which will result in a dangerous dependency on imports?

Can we permit our mines to stand idle or be flooded—and our thousands of miners to be deprived of their means of earning a living?

I do not believe we can if we are to maintain a strong America.

I ask unanimous consent that tables showing our iron ore imports and our domestic production be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately

referred; and, without objection, the tables will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3729) to provide for a program which will contribute to the national defense by encouraging the continuing operation of the iron mines in the United States, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The tables presented by Mr. McNAMARA are as follows:

United States imports of iron ore, 1872-1957
[In gross tons]

Year	Gross tons	Year	Gross tons	Year	Gross tons
1872 ¹	23,733	1901	966,950	1930	2,775,124
1873	45,981	1902	1,105,470	1931	1,465,613
1874	57,987	1903	980,440	1932	1,582,498
1875	56,655	1904	487,613	1933	861,153
1876	17,284	1905	845,651	1934	1,427,521
1877	30,669	1906	1,060,390	1935	1,492,435
1878	28,212	1907	1,229,168	1936	2,232,229
1879	434,338	1908	776,898	1937	2,442,069
1880	493,408	1909	1,694,957	1938	2,122,455
1881	782,887	1910	2,591,031	1939	2,412,515
1882	589,655	1911	1,811,732	1940	2,479,326
1883	490,875	1912	2,104,576	1941	2,343,983
1884	487,820	1913	2,594,770	1942	731,325
1885	390,786	1914	1,350,588	1943	399,117
1886	1,039,433	1915	1,341,281	1944	463,532
1887	1,194,301	1916	1,325,736	1945	1,197,925
1888	587,470	1917	971,663	1946	4,895,652
1889	853,573	1918	787,468	1947	6,091,677
1890	1,246,830	1919	476,461	1948	7,391,291
1891	912,864	1920	1,273,456	1949	8,281,237
1892	806,585	1921	1,315,768	1950	10,139,678
1893	526,951	1922	1,135,156	1951	9,760,625
1894	167,307	1923	2,788,430	1952	11,074,035
1895	524,153	1924	2,047,057	1953	15,792,450
1896	682,806	1925	2,100,695	1954	23,471,956
1897	489,970	1926	2,555,441	1955	30,431,152
1898	187,208	1927	2,620,717	1956	33,653,048
1899	674,082	1928	2,452,646	1957	
1900	897,831	1929	3,139,334		

¹ First year of record according to Mineral Resources, 1909; American State Papers, and Foreign Commerce and Navigation record values but not quantities for earlier years.

Source: Bureau of Mines.

Production of iron ore in the United States, 1880-1957¹

Year	Gross tons	Year	Gross tons	Year	Gross tons
1880	7,120,362	1906	47,749,728	1932	9,846,916
1881	7,119,643	1907	51,720,619	1933	17,553,188
1882	8,700,000	1908	35,983,336	1934	24,587,616
1883	8,800,000	1909	51,294,271	1935	30,540,252
1884	7,718,129	1910	57,014,906	1936	48,788,745
1885	7,600,000	1911	43,876,552	1937	72,093,548
1886	10,600,000	1912	55,150,147	1938	28,447,282
1887	11,300,000	1913	61,980,437	1939	51,731,730
1888	12,062,530	1914	41,439,761	1940	73,695,899
1889	14,518,041	1915	55,526,490	1941	92,409,579
1890	10,036,043	1916	75,167,672	1942	105,526,195
1891	14,591,178	1917	75,288,851	1943	101,257,835
1892	16,296,666	1918	69,658,278	1944	94,117,705
1893	11,587,629	1919	60,965,418	1945	88,376,393
1894	11,879,679	1920	67,004,465	1946	70,843,113
1895	15,957,614	1921	29,490,978	1947	93,001,520
1896	16,005,449	1922	47,128,527	1948	101,003,492
1897	17,518,046	1923	69,351,442	1949	84,937,447
1898	19,433,716	1924	54,267,419	1950	98,045,390
1899	24,683,173	1925	61,907,997	1951	116,504,672
1900	27,553,161	1926	67,623,000	1952	97,918,004
1901	28,887,479	1927	61,741,100	1953	117,994,769
1902	35,554,135	1928	62,197,088	1954	78,128,794
1903	35,019,308	1929	73,027,720	1955	102,998,969
1904	27,644,330	1930	58,408,664	1956	97,848,936
1905	42,526,133	1931	31,131,502	1957	105,386,000

¹ Preliminary.

² Includes byproduct ore after 1941.

Source: Bureau of Mines.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc.,

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address entitled "Communications: 20th Century Ideas in Motion" delivered by him before Department of Audio-Visual Instruction of the National Education Association Convention in Minneapolis.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Correspondence between him and Senator SMATHERS, and editorial entitled "First Aid to Railroads," published in the Portland Oregonian of April 24, 1958, all relating to repeal of Federal transportation taxes.

NATIONAL DEFENSE—ADDRESS BY GEN. CURTIS E. LEMAY

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, when Gen. Curtis LeMay speaks, I listen out of respect for a man who speaks only when he has something worth while to say. But when he speaks about national defense, especially as it involves airpower, I feel that I must recognize his airmanship and leadership and must pay even closer attention.

In a speech before the national conference of the National Association of State and Territorial Civil Defense Directors, on April 10, 1958, General LeMay discussed the Soviet threat and the Air Force answer to that threat. Permit me to bring out a few of the salient points of the speech.

The principal threat to the United States is the Soviet capability for air delivery of nuclear weapons against the United States. Another, but secondary threat, is the Soviet submarine menace. The air threat is both serious and immediate.

Modern and well-equipped with long-range jet bombers, the Soviet air arm is manned by professionals. Quite apparently the U. S. S. R. aims to surpass the airpower of the United States. Their aims lead them toward development of an ICBM which can be launched from deep within the Soviet Union, and which can, in 30 minutes, strike the United States.

Besides the threat of strength and equipment, the Soviets have the advantage of initiative and surprise.

The answer to these Soviet threats is simply this:

Maintain the United States capability for fighting and winning the air battle. The Air Force knows that the best defense is a good offense, and experience has taught the Air Force that a determined air offensive cannot be stopped. We now possess the capability to penetrate and strike the very heart of the enemy's war potential. Today we have the airpower edge. We must not lose it tomorrow.

Our offensive and defensive reaction to the Soviet air threat is measured in time to launch our striking forces and in time to alert our defenses. Our reaction must be quick, a matter of minutes, rather than hours. The United States must improve, and the Air Force is improving, its reaction capabilities.

Within 15 minutes of the initial warning, one-third of our strategic striking forces should be on the way to their targets. To achieve this kind of alertness, the Air Force must have the

facilities, the crews, and the dispersal it requires. But we have not yet reached that goal. True, portions of our strategic air forces are on 24-hour alert, and will be heading for their targets within 15 minutes. But the funds necessary to provide these missing elements and to fully prepare us against the threat must be forthcoming.

As ballistic missiles are integrated into our forces, the alert picture will improve. Missiles, however, cannot replace all of our manned bomber forces. We must have both piloted and unpiloted systems. Each has advantages and disadvantages. The combination of the two systems will give us greater offensive power.

Mr. President, I endorse the views expressed by General LeMay; and I ask all Members of Congress to give serious consideration to what General LeMay has described as the Soviet threat. Our Department of Defense cannot supply the answer alone. We of the Congress must supply a large part of it.

I ask unanimous consent that General LeMay's speech be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE THREAT—THE ANSWER

(Remarks by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, before the national conference of the National Association of State and Territorial Civil Defense Directors, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., April 10, 1958)

INTRODUCTION

General Huebner, leaders of the civil-defense effort, and guests, I appreciate your invitation to come here today because it gives me the opportunity to talk to men and women who have a somewhat special interest in Air Force plans for the defense of our country.

Air delivery of nuclear weapons has placed people everywhere within the battle zone. Solution of the problem of individual and national survival in what President Eisenhower has called an age of peril is the most pressing task that Americans face today. Civil defense is a great and difficult part of this task.

In his letter inviting me to appear here, General Huebner suggested that I discuss the threat which faces us and the defensive measures which we in the Air Force consider of value. This, I certainly will be glad to do. I hope that some of this information will be of use to you in the continued development of the civil-defense program.

THE THREAT

General Twining, in an address before the western industrial survival conference in Los Angeles last month, stated that the military threat posed by the Soviet bloc is one of the greatest in history. He went on to say that the total strength of the Communist bloc armed forces consists of more than 8 million men—with 450 divisions, 500 submarines and over 25,000 operational aircraft.

Numbers in themselves do not mean everything. However, when we compare present day Soviet bloc figures with World War II figures and also take into consideration the Soviet nuclear air capability, the many improvements in weapons and their recent scientific achievements, it is obvious that the Soviet bloc is on a war footing today.

The principal threat to the United States, of course, is the Soviet capability to de-

liver nuclear weapons by air. The Soviet Union now has in its inventory numerous high speed jet medium and heavy bombers that are capable of flying intercontinental missions with nuclear weapons of high energy yield against any target in the United States. Another serious and growing menace is the Soviet submarine threat. However, I want to emphasize that the most serious and immediate threat is Soviet air power.

The Soviet long range air force is a modern, well-equipped organization commanded and operated by professional airmen. It is backed up by a good air facility network and logistical support system. Their long range striking force is now composed primarily of Badger medium jet bombers similar in performance characteristics to our own B-47. In lesser numbers, but having considerably more capability and range are the Bison heavy jet bombers, similar in performance to our B-52, and the Bear heavy turboprop bombers. All of these Soviet aircraft are considered capable of carrying high yield nuclear weapons which we have very good reason to believe are now available.

I think it is quite apparent, that the Communist leaders are striving mightily to surpass the United States in airpower. Toward this end, they are modernizing their long-range air force through the introduction of higher performance aircraft and missiles. When the Soviets successfully develop a long-range ICBM, they will have the capability to strike anywhere in the United States within 30 minutes of launch from deep within the Soviet Union.

Another important component of the Soviet threat is their possession of the advantages of initiative and surprise. This confronts us with more difficult problems as their airpower capabilities increase. It is possible that they could launch an attack against us where, when, and how they choose without advance warning. We would not take such advantage.

AIR FORCE COUNTER TO THE SOVIET THREAT

Although all facets of the Soviet military strength are great, our priority task must be to maintain the capability to fight and win the air battle. I join with you in hoping such a battle will never be fought. I do not think it will be fought if our airpower stands supreme—and our determination to use it, if necessary, is known.

To maintain the capability to fight and win the air battle, the Air Force believes in the old adage that the best defense is a good offense. That is why we have built strong strategic strike forces which can attack targets anywhere in the world. We are dedicated to keeping this force in a high state of proficiency—as a strong reminder that attacks upon us will result in the attacker's destruction.

Air Force experience in three wars has demonstrated that a determined air offensive cannot be stopped. Today, we have better equipment, more effective techniques and better trained personnel. With this combination we possess the capability to penetrate to the very heart of an enemy's target system.

I feel we possess an airpower edge today, but this advantage is being rapidly closed. Our goal is to keep ahead.

Closely allied to this goal is the necessity to be capable of quick reaction, both on the offense and on the defense. But warning is essential to reaction of any type and warning must be measured in time—time to launch our strike forces and time to alert our defenses.

Under present programs, our system for notifying us of approaching jet aircraft will provide us several hours warning when completed. With the advent of hypersonic ballistic missiles, however, warning will be measured in minutes instead of hours. The

shorter the warning, the faster must be our reaction. That is why we are concentrating on improving our reaction capabilities.

We have maintained our air defense forces on alert for many years. Our radars have been scanning the skies and our interceptor pilots have been standing by with armed aircraft ready to attack any invader. But as the probable warning time decreases, the need to also have our offensive forces on alert becomes more critical. We cannot permit our striking force to be caught on the ground and destroyed. Within minutes of warning, they too must be in the air and on their way to enemy targets.

To achieve this goal, we have established a requirement to have one-third of our strategic striking force on the way to their targets within 15 minutes of initial warning. To do this requires adequate alert facilities, additional dispersal bases and well-trained personnel who know their jobs.

Varying types of construction are required to reach such an alert posture. Parking stubs must be provided for quick access to the takeoff end of the runway by aircraft on alert status; we must have readyroom facilities for alert crews, failproof communications, security facilities for the alert area and supporting land and utilities.

To reduce the vulnerability and increase the reaction capability of the strike force, we also need further dispersal of SAC units. Dispersal offers two primary advantages. First of all, better protection is afforded. Secondly, with more bases available, our reaction time is improved greatly because we can launch more aircraft faster. Our ultimate objective is to disperse the strategic bomber force so that not more than 15 B-52's or 45 B-47's, with their supporting tankers, will occupy one base.

We have not yet achieved the goal we seek. But today we do have portions of our strategic force on 24 hour alert and capable of becoming airborne and on their way to targets within 15 minutes. Additional funds recently appropriated by Congress for this fiscal year and funds we anticipate being appropriated for fiscal year 1959 will provide money for the facilities we need to insure an adequate alert and dispersal posture for our strategic forces.

As strategic ballistic missiles are integrated into our forces, our alert picture will improve. Initially, strategic missiles will augment our offensive striking forces. As we learn more about them and know that they will be able to accomplish the job they are designed to do, they will replace a portion of our manned bomber force. However, as far into the future as I can see, I feel we must have integrated forces of both piloted and unpiloted systems to give us greater flexibility in our operations. Missiles have certain limitations which piloted vehicles do not. Also, missiles have certain advantages that piloted vehicles do not. The combination of the two systems will give us much greater offensive power.

As I mentioned earlier, warning is essential to reaction and we are working hard to improve our warning system. The distant early warning (DEW) line which runs across the northern part of Canada was completed last July. The Aleutian and eastern extensions to this line are still in work. This warning system, in conjunction with other radar nets within Canada and the United States and the semiautomatic ground environment system, popularly known as the SAGE system, will provide a very comprehensive warning and control network for defense against jet aircraft. Tied in with our radar system is the Ground Observer Corps with which I'm sure you are familiar.

We are also hard at work on the development of an effective ballistic missile detection capability. Breakthroughs in radar research

realized last summer give us confidence that we can attain success in this field.

I would like to point out at this time that both of the radar warning systems I have described must be fully developed. We must perfect our warning and control systems against both the manned and missile threat.

Our manned interceptor forces are rapidly being converted to the supersonic F-102. Four air-to-air missiles are now in the air defense armory. One of these is the MB-1 or Genie nuclear weapon. The other three missiles are of the radar bombing and heat-seeking types. All of these missiles would be effective against manned jet bombers.

The Air Force also has under development a long-range surface-to-air missile known as the Bomarc. This is a supersonic weapon designed for high altitude intercepts at ranges of well over 200 miles. This weapon has exceeded initial expectations in tests.

Four Bomarc sites are already under construction, at McGuire AFB, N. J.; Otis AFB, Mass.; Suffolk County AFB, N. Y.; and at Dow AFB, Maine.

The Air Force has under research and development many other projects designed to improve both our offensive and defensive capabilities. We look forward to higher performance aircraft with greater ranges, new and improved missiles, and better warning systems. In these projects, reaction capability continues to be a prime consideration.

AIR FORCE-CIVIL DEFENSE COOPERATION

I have tried to briefly highlight what the Air Force is doing both for the offense and for the defense. Our actions are designed to deter war. If we can maintain our offensive and defensive capabilities strong enough to convince an aggressor that he would inevitably lose, I believe there is a good chance that there never will be need for you to carry out the war emergency plans of civil defense. This would be the best kind of victory for all of us. But what if the deterrent power should fail to be convincing enough and a potential enemy attacks?

In that case, the Air Force would bend very effort, concentrate every possible strength and usable resource, to win the air battle. This, we believe, would be the Air Force's greatest possible service to the people of the United States. Should an enemy attack, initial damage to our country would be severe. But, the duration of intensive enemy attacks will be an even more highly critical factor in our survival. The first aim of the Air Force is to blunt and then halt the enemy attacks as quickly as possible.

With your understanding, cooperation, and help the Air Force will be free to concentrate on throwing the full weight of United States air power into the battle. This support is needed to shorten the critical initial period.

Should an attack come, the better the civil population is organized and prepared, the less casualties will result. The problem and the solution will be largely local. As I have pointed out, the Air Force will not be able to offer substantial assistance. We will be fighting the air battle. Your duties as civil defense directors and the jobs of the many thousands of others who will assist you will be most difficult. They will become more difficult as the attacks continue. If your Air Force, through fast reaction, can reduce the critical attack period by one day—or even a few hours—the burden will be lightened.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I want to stress that the cooperative efforts of military commanders and civil defense representatives at the local level are of the utmost importance. The first phase of Operation Alert for 1958 is to take place next month. The Air Force is emphasizing to its commanders the importance of community-level planning and ordering them to do everything consistent

with their military responsibilities to assure the maximum civil-defense effort. In my opinion, strength at the local level is indispensable to the overall success of our combined efforts.

Today, as never before, the military and civil defense must work together to assure that we can win the air battle if it ever has to be fought. Toward this end, we in the Air Force look forward to the continuation and growth of the partnership which now exists.

ACTION ON LABOR LAWS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "For Action on Labor Laws," which appears in today's issue of the New York Times.

I believe the editorial provides an excellent analysis of the legislative situation in the Congress, as it pertains to labor legislation, and I commend the editorial to the consideration of all concerned.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR ACTION ON LABOR LAWS

It is all to the good that the Senate finally mastered, as it did, the cross-currents—political, personal, and pro or anti labor—through which it floundered for several days. That the vote in favor of the welfare fund regulation bill was unanimous shows that the Senators themselves felt that way too, in the end.

All the amendments that went beyond welfare fund operations were voted down—Senator KNOWLAND's along with the more liberal ones sponsored by the administration and the more drastic proposals of others. And it is well that they were, all 39 of them. Such basic legislation as union regulation should not be written on the floor of the Senate by amendments to a different measure, but only after thorough committee study and full public hearings.

The bill as approved—providing for registration and complete disclosure of employee welfare funds, with false reporting made a Federal crime—now goes to the House for action. But so far the Education and Labor Committee, of which Congressman BARDEN is chairman, has dragged its feet on all the 15 labor bills it has before it. We hope that the unanimous Senate vote, the approval of organized labor, and the rising insistence of the public will move this one along.

But even more important is action by the Senate committee on the entire range of labor regulation bills which are now before it. Chairman KENNEDY has promised to resume his subcommittee hearings on them May 5 and a bipartisan group of Senators is pledged to an attempt to force legislation out of the committee if not forthcoming before June 10.

Not since the days when the Taft-Hartley law was being fashioned has organized labor faced so dangerous a legislative crisis as this. It can oppose every kind of regulation—the way it did in 1947, allowing all the initiative to come from outsiders, many of them bitterly anti-labor. Or it can cooperate in the hearings, as its leaders have now pledged, and present positive proposals of its own. This would be far more likely to give labor the fair hearing it deserves and to decrease the chance of legislation that would hamstring its legitimate activities. Labor needs to keep its friends as well as to confound its enemies—especially at this moment in its history.

PAY FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senate unanimously passed the military pay bill of 1958, and sent it to conference.

During the debate on this important measure, various Senators expressed the opinion that the time-honored principle of maintaining retired pay at a percentage of active duty pay should be preserved as, perhaps, the greatest single incentive to long service by the hard core of our military services which is so essential to the country and the basic purpose of the legislation itself.

There were expressions of hope, with which I agree, that, at some future time, this principle will be reestablished, and those on the retired lists will be included for the same computation of their retired pay as the pending legislation authorizes for those who, by happenstance, retire after the effective date of this new legislation.

Yesterday, the day when this body passed the proposed legislation, the New York Times published an editorial which completely and emphatically accords with this principle. On two former occasions, I placed in the RECORD editorials from the Washington Star. In order that Senators may have opportunity to read the New York Times editorial, even though belatedly, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR THE ARMED FORCES

The military pay and incentive bill, which is scheduled to come before the Senate for a vote today, needs some rethinking and rewording before passage. On the whole, the bill should help to provide both the material and psychological boost which the services require if they are to retain skilled professionals. But the attempt to make the measure all things to all ranks, and the elimination of certain provisions recommended in the report of the Committee headed by Ralph J. Cordiner, vitiate some of the objectives desired.

As the administration has pointed out, the bill as passed by the House increases somewhat too much the pay of the lower enlisted and commissioned ranks. It is, indeed, debatable whether or not a man should automatically qualify for a pay raise if he simply serves more than 2 years. The pay and retirement provisions are also an inducement to retirement in certain grades—something that certainly was not intended.

More important, the bill departs fundamentally from a basic concept that has governed every military pay bill until now. The Cordiner Committee report rightly stressed that "military retirement and its firm tie-in with active duty compensation is perhaps the most powerful long-term career incentive existing within the military compensation system. . . . The incentive value of [the] existing military retirement program depends to a major degree upon its integral relationship with active duty compensation and the confidence which has been built up in the military body that no breach of faith or breach of retirement contract has ever been permitted by the Congress and the American people."

The present bill departs from this principle, in effect violates the retirement contract and divorces present retired pay completely from regular pay. Those officers

already retired are offered a 6-percent cost-of-living sop—but not the benefits of officers who will subsequently retire. Under this bill it will be entirely possible for a major general who retires after this bill is passed to receive \$2,125 more annually than an officer of similar rank who retires a day before its passage.

This and other inequities in the current legislation need further consideration before passage.

BUSINESS AND POLITICS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, this morning there was published in the New York Daily News an editorial which I wish to read into the RECORD, in connection with a request which I shall make to have an address printed in the RECORD.

The editorial is entitled "Business and Politics," and reads as follows:

BUSINESS AND POLITICS

As most of us know, numerous labor leaders are in politics up to their chins nowadays—though there is still grave doubt whether they can deliver any sizable labor vote anywhere. However, they have planted various stooges in Congress and the State legislatures.

ARGUE THE CASE FOR CAPITALISM

At the annual meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce in Washington yesterday, New York attorney Theodore R. Iserman urged businessmen all over the country to promote some backfires against this labor-leader politicking, by organizing political education and discussion groups.

These units would broadcast business and industrial opinions on important issues, publicize candidates' records of friendliness or unfriendliness toward capitalism, etc.

It sounds good to us, and we think a lot of business people had better get cracking—unless they're willing to see labor politicians of the Reuther type gradually chain this country to their chariot wheels.

Mr. President, in connection with the editorial, and because it refers to Mr. Iserman, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD the speech Mr. Iserman delivered yesterday to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. His speech is entitled "The Growing Power of Labor Unions."

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GROWING POWER OF LABOR UNIONS

(By Theodore R. Iserman, Kelley, Drye, Newhall & Maginnes, New York, N. Y.)

One of the greatest political and economic phenomena of the past half century of our country's history has been the surging growth, particularly over the past 20 years, in the power of labor unions and, more especially, of union leaders.

This power today constitutes a more immediate threat to our way of life than does the military might of Soviet Russia, with her sputniks, ballistic missiles and nuclear weapons. Against the Russian threat, we have the deterrent of immediate, massive retaliation. But against the growing powers of labor leaders in political and economic spheres and the continued use of those powers to take us farther and farther along the road toward an odd mixture of socialism and fascism, we have no such defense. Slowing the trend, let alone halting or reversing it, calls for tremendous, tireless and intelligent effort.

Before getting into what we should do, let us see how the unions acquired their powers.

There is one basic source of both the political power and the economic power of unions and their leaders. This is the Wagner Act, now part of the Taft-Hartley Act. This guarantees the right of employees to organize, requires employers to recognize and deal with any union that the majority of the employees in a bargaining unit choose as their representative, no matter how small the majority may be, and gives to the union the exclusive right, even to the exclusion of the individual himself, to handle all dealings between all the employees and their employer. This gives to the unions greater control over the individual than any other organization in the Free World has over its members.

Thanks to the Labor Board's zeal, especially in its early days, in punishing employers who did anything to dissuade their employees from joining unions, and in so rigging elections that unions rarely could lose, the law has subjected millions of employees and their terms and conditions of employment to the control of unions and their leaders, in many instances against the wishes of large minorities of the employees. Add to all this the law's allowing, in most States, unions and employers to agree that all employees must be members of a union and pay dues to it as a condition of employment, and the violence, threats, and other coercion that unions use on dissenters, and you have a basis on which unions can develop tremendous power, and have done so. The National Labor Relations Act and the coercive acts and practices of unions under the law or regardless of it make mere pawns of working men and women in the great games the labor leaders play, with the futures of all of us as stakes.

You, as businessmen, are fully familiar with the economic power of unions. Most of you, I daresay, have felt the force of that power in dealing with representatives of your own employees or in having employees of other employers refuse to handle goods that you produce or that you need for your business.

The Clayton Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act add to the power of unions and their leaders. Although all other citizens and organizations—schools, churches, professional associations, chambers of commerce—are fully subject to the injunctive process, these acts make it virtually impossible to enjoin against even the most irresponsible of union activities. Except in very narrow areas, these acts, also, in effect, immunize unions against the antitrust laws. When a single union represents employees of substantially all the competing employers in an entire industry, as is the case in most of our industries today, it has a monopoly, and one that the law enforces by compelling employers to deal with it exclusively. The mineworkers, the steelworkers, the automobile workers and dozens of others have strangleholds on the industries whose employees they represent, and through those industries can bring our country to the brink of disaster, as they have done time after time, in peace and in war. And the teamsters, now controlled by that great labor statesman Jimmy Hoffa and uncounted numbers of racketeers, crooks, and hoodlums, can bring our country to its knees in a matter of days, which is more than Khrushchev can do.

Perhaps nothing more clearly illustrates the economic power of labor leaders than happenings in the past 6 months. Notwithstanding layoffs, short workweeks, growing unemployment, and relatively hard times in most areas of our economy, unions, for the first time in a recession, have forced prices up by forcing wages up. They have, in effect, repealed the law of supply and demand.

We turn now to the political aspects of the labor movement.

Samuel Gompers, the A. F. of L.'s first president, said years ago that labor leaders could not deliver working men's votes. John L. Lewis found this out for himself in 1940 when he repudiated F. D. R., staked his presidency of the CIO on his delivering the so-called labor vote for Willkie, and lost. It probably still is true that the rank and file would pay little attention to mere endorsements by union officials of particular candidates. But union officials who are politically ambitious or who are greedy for political power, and their name is legion, have greatly changed their methods since Gompers' day and even since 1940. They now do far more than merely endorse candidates and they try to influence far more votes than the labor vote, as we shall see.

I have mentioned the National Labor Relations Act as a basic source of the economic and political power of unions.

A second important source of their political power, and it stems largely from the first, is money. Thanks again to compulsory unionism and compulsory payment of union dues and initiation fees, unions have almost unlimited financial resources for political purposes. And subsidiary to this is an ability to spend the money astutely and where, from the union leaders' point of view, it does the most good.

It is true that the War Labor Disputes Act and, later, the Taft-Hartley Act, purported to forbid unions to make political contributions or expenditures. But Taft-Hartley's prohibition applies only to primaries and general elections involving Federal officials—President, Vice President, and Members of Congress. The laws of only five States purport to inhibit political spending by unions. All other States permit unions to spend their funds freely in State and local elections, in electing party officials and in supporting or opposing particular issues, such as referendums on right-to-work laws. And as the Supreme Court has interpreted the Taft-Hartley Act, that act still permits unions to spend vast untaxed sums out of their treasuries on political activities.

They can devote column after column of their thousands of magazines and newspapers to vilifying and abusing politicians they cannot control, praising to the skies the ones they can, and exhorting their readers to vote for one candidate as against another. The November 1956 issue of the *United Automobile Worker* is typical of scores of publications of national and international unions and thousands of publications of local unions. At least 80 percent of that issue is political. The whole first page proclaims:

"For a Better America—Back Adlai and Estes." Inside banner headlines scream:

"KEFAUVER Right—Nixon Wrong."

"Why You Need Adlai for Better Schools."

"Scandals Besmirch Eisenhower Rule," and so on.

By way of contrast, in countless house organs throughout the country, employers report the outcome of softball games and record weddings, deaths, and retirements of employees and the doings of the quarter-century clubs, but say never a word on political or economic issues that are of the gravest concern to themselves and their employees, let alone take sides on controversial issues. And more often than not, their trade papers are equally silent on those issues.

Besides spending members' dues on union publications, union leaders, notwithstanding the Taft-Hartley Act, dip into their bulging union treasuries to finance with untaxed funds other widespread political activities that many of their members, or even the majority, may oppose. They do this on the radio and on television and through other mediums that reach the general public, expounding their views and making clear what candidates support their views and

what ones do not. Unions buy more than 2,000 15-minute periods of radio and television time each week and much, much more in some weeks. They call this political education and get away with it.

Another type of political activity in which union leaders are extremely effective is in furnishing manpower during registration and on and before election day. Both their power over employees as their exclusive bargaining agents and their great financial resources contribute to their effectiveness. As exclusive bargaining agents, they can command what they call volunteers for many political chores, not only from the rank and file, but from a host of stewards and other union officials. And they can hire swarms of special organizers, whom they pay up to \$30 a day plus expenses. All these people ring doorbells, make telephone campaigns, act as baby sitters, provide transportation, watch at the polls, distribute handbills and other literature, and do the hundred and one other things that an effective campaign calls for. In 1956 the Steelworkers alone probably had upward of 12,000 people available for this kind of work and the UAW at least 30,000. The UAW and the Steelworkers are only 2 of the merged labor movement's 138 international unions.

In order to get around the limited restrictions that the War Labor Disputes Act and Taft-Hartley put on political spending by unions, the CIO, during World War II, set up its political-action committees, and the A. F. of L. followed suit with its Labor's League for Political Education. Now that the A. F. of L. and the CIO have merged, these two political organizations have become one—COPE, Committee on Political Education. COPE, like its predecessors, parallels the National, State, and local levels of the great labor organizations. The same people that control the AFL-CIO control COPE and its constituent national and local affiliates. COPE and its branches are political fronts for the labor organizations, set up to do things that labor organizations may not do under Taft-Hartley. To raise the necessary wherewithal, COPE depends on what labor leaders, with tongue in cheek, call voluntary contributions. Stewards and committeemen in the plants ordinarily solicit the contributions. Aside from employees' fear of obloquy and abuse and other social pressures to contribute, the union's power over employees as their exclusive bargaining agent will make the average employee think twice before refusing to contribute, no matter how unenthusiastic he may be about the union's political activities or the candidates it supports. Money they collect this way, union leaders may lawfully use in any way they choose, including direct contributions to candidates for Federal office.

It is impossible to get accurate information on unions' political spending. While the public records indicate that labor's political affiliates contributed only \$26,500 to the election of Pat McNAMARA as Senator from Michigan in 1954, a study by the Association for Industrialization of Mobilization indicates that the UAW alone spent \$725,000 out of union funds in the Michigan campaign. Labor's admitted contribution to the campaign of Senator DOUGLAS, \$35,500, and to Senator KEFAUVER, \$18,888. But the hidden expenditures on behalf of these and other darlings of the AFL-CIO doubtless amounted to many times more.

In 1956, the political fronts for 17 of the 138 international unions admittedly raised by so-called voluntary contributions \$2,987,072. There is clear evidence that this is a gross understatement. How much political affiliates of the other international unions spent and how much State and local affiliates spent, we can only guess. But we can conservatively estimate that every union spent 10 times as much out of union treasuries on activities that Taft-Hartley does not

forbid as it did of "voluntary" contributions on activities that Taft-Hartley covers. Congressman RALPH W. GWINN, who has devoted much time to the subject, estimates that unions average at least \$62 million a year in political spending.

I said that union leaders are astute in spending their members' dollars. One of the smartest things they do is to treat elections of State legislators and representatives to Congress as being at least as important as elections to higher office. For example, in 1948 the labor politicians put such emphasis on the senatorial and Congressional races that for the first time in our history a winning presidential candidate, Mr. Truman, polled fewer votes than his party's candidates for the House of Representatives.

Labor leaders are astute, also, in that they do not waste time or money on candidates in areas where they have no chance of winning. They do not waste them in areas where their favorites are bound to win anyway. They spend them in primaries and general elections in which their candidates have a chance.

They do not spend money on men with whom they are in general agreement but who have some independence. They spend it on men who they feel sure will dance to their tune. When a Congressman in Michigan's Sixth District, who had won in 1954 with the UAW's backing, defied the UAW on a single issue, farm price supports, the UAW dumped him, notwithstanding that a poll of the Congressman's district showed that his constituents supported him overwhelmingly on this issue. The vitriolic outburst by the Machinists' president, Al Hayes, a week or so ago against Senator KENNEDY for sponsoring a measure to protect union members against corrupt or ruthless union officials, shows how union leaders demand of politicians they support 100 percent, full-time obedience. After Hayes' blast, Senator KENNEDY voted against a measure carrying out one of his own proposals. What this shows, I leave to your judgment.

Union leaders do not limit themselves to appealing to the so-called labor vote. True, they go after it hammer and tongs, using every demagogic device and going to all lengths to stir up class hatreds in our heretofore classless society. But they are all things to all men, vocal on civil rights in the big northern cities, not so vocal when it comes to backing YARBOROUGH, of Texas, or in eliminating racists from union leadership in the South; heartbroken over the prices farmers receive for what they grow, but silent about the high wages that raise the prices that farmers must pay for what they buy; vociferous in demanding protection for the small-business man, except at the bargaining table.

I should mention a third source of labor leaders' political power. Some politicians accept as a fact labor leaders' assertions that they represent 36 million votes. Some, 10 years after the event, assume, incorrectly, that Truman's victory over Dewey in 1948 demonstrated the political power of unions and abjectly acquiesce to labor leaders' demands, particularly in voting on labor issues. They forget the victories of men like Taft, Nixon, Dirksen and Bennett in 1950. Courage, intelligence and integrity, plus bone-tiring hard work, enabled them to win elections in which, unlike the one in 1948, Taft-Hartley was a central issue.

And here let me interject the observation that it is not primarily an interest in so-called labor legislation that prompts the tremendous efforts and huge spending by unions in politics.

George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, says:

"The scene of battle is no longer the company plant or the picket line. It has moved into the legislative Halls of Congress and the State legislatures."

And James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the industrial union department of the AFL-CIO, says:

"More and more, the answers to labor's problems are political."

And Walter Reuther, in January 1958 put his views succinctly when he said:

"You can go to work and lobby your head off and you can go to Washington and lobby your head off and you can go to Lansing and lobby your head off, or you can go to any other State capital, but if you haven't got responsible people (and by this he means people responsible to him) in government sitting in the State legislatures, or in the Federal Congress, all the lobbying in the world will not do any good."

True, the labor politicians are vitally interested in the eighty-odd proposals for labor legislation now pending before Congress. But their interest also is in far wider fields—socialized housing, socialized power, socialized medicine, soak-the-rich taxation, Federal control of education, socialized atomic energy, halting nuclear testing, foreign affairs, farm legislation, and many others. Indeed, the great majority of the issues on which they rate legislators right or wrong have nothing to do with labor unions, collective bargaining or wages, hours, and working conditions.

Now, what have been the results of the labor leaders' politicking? In general, these efforts have resulted in a shift to the left by all political alignments. We used to have in politics a right, a center, and a left. Now, with apologies to Senator MUNDT and Senator GOLDWATER, two outstanding exceptions that prove the rule, there is no right. We have a center, a left, and an extreme left.

Another result that we can state in general terms is that in most States outside the South the labor politicians, with such allies as the Americans for Democratic Action and the Committee for an Effective Congress, have taken over the Democratic Party, body, boots, and breeches, and have captured important segments of the Republican Party.

More specifically, the labor politicians have made great gains in both Houses of Congress and in State legislatures, in numbers, in members they place on key committees and in their ability to intimidate some politicians who, left to their own devices, would tend to be independent. And, in this connection, now might be a good time for someone to write a book entitled "Profiles in Cowardice."

Notwithstanding General Eisenhower's landslide in 1952, the Republicans managed to capture only 219 House seats as against 215 for the Democrats. In 1954, the Democrats won control of both Houses of Congress with a net gain in the House of 17 seats, for at least 10 of which labor help was decisive. They got control of the Senate when McNAMARA in Michigan and NEUBERGER in Oregon, both with prodigious labor backing, defeated Senator Ferguson and Douglas McKay.

In 1956, the Democratic National Committee concentrated on the presidential campaign, and COPE and its allies in effect ran the Congressional campaign for the Democrats. While President Eisenhower scored an impressive victory, COPE increased the Democrat majority in the House to 233 seats as against the Republicans' 200. The labor leaders were active in 300 Congressional Districts which, for the most part, were doubtful, and elected their candidates in well over 60 percent of these districts. And not all the Republicans, by any means, were conservatives. Many were left-of-center or left.

COPE and its allies scored striking gains in governorships and State legislatures in 1956 and again last year.

The intense interest labor leaders have in bills now pending in Congress touching all phases of American life makes it certain that this year they will be active politically—perhaps more active than ever before. We can

predict with confidence that they will stage an all-out drive to elect a subservient Congress—in their newspapers, on radio, and television, with union funds and with so-called voluntary contributions and volunteer electioneering.

What will the business people do? Will we continue to devote our house organs to the scores of softball games, to weddings, deaths, and births, saying nothing about the issues in the campaign, much less presenting our views on them?

I am not going to exhort you on your duties as individual citizens or on what you ought to do in your own self-interest. You know this. Find out what the candidates' views are, and tell them your views. Support with time and money those whose beliefs correspond with your own, whether it is a LAUSCH in Ohio or a GOLDWATER in Arizona.

But beyond this, what can organized business do? It seems to me that organized business and industry might take at least a few pages from the book of the AFL-CIO and COPE. We have the national chamber, the NAM, and dozens of nationwide trade associations, thousands of State and local chambers of commerce and manufacturing associations. I heartily recommend that the national organizations explore their political potentialities, acting both on their own and in collaboration with affiliates throughout the country. I recommend that you, in your local organizations, determine what issues and what candidates deserve the support of organized business, and that your organizations, in a measure, at least, give them that support. You can discuss the issues publicly and support your views, publicize the voting records of candidates on issues of concern to business, tell at least your members what candidates you prefer and why, and, with a minimum of cash, organize your own people to duplicate in some small measure the intensive efforts of paid and unpaid minions of the AFL-CIO. I urge you not to dismiss these suggestions lightly, but to consider them carefully and carry them back home with you and begin to act on them at once.

It is time for us to stop assuming that those politicians who are ready, able, and willing to fight for free enterprise, for truly free collective bargaining and for a sound economy can preserve our way of life with niggardly help from us, or none at all. It is time for us to stop assuming that a mysterious someone else can shoulder the political responsibilities that too many of us have been shirking. And it is time for men in business and industry to concern themselves, individually and through existing organizations or affiliated ones, with those issues on which the overwhelming majority of us agree, and to support those candidates, regardless of party, who share our views.

Thank you.

UNITED STATES PROPOSAL IN THE UNITED NATIONS FOR ARCTIC INSPECTION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the events which took place in the Security Council of the United Nations yesterday are an impressive tribute to the imaginative diplomacy of Ambassador Lodge. Secretary Hammarskjöld's unprecedented appeal in the Security Council for Russia to accept the United States proposal for Arctic inspection and the unanimous support which the proposal received from the other members of the Council constituted one of America's most effective victories in the forum of world opinion.

In the New York Herald Tribune of yesterday, April 29, the lead editorial

pointed out that Ambassador Lodge's proposal is far more than "a clever psychological blow in the cold war." It is, above all, a sincere, obviously reasonable attempt to lessen the chance of triggering an all-out nuclear war. It is a simple, limited step which, if accepted by Russia, could lead to a major breakthrough in the long stalemate over disarmament. I ask unanimous consent that the Tribune editorial, entitled "A Big Test at the U. N.," be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BIG TEST AT THE U. N.

The peoples of all the world live in dread of an atomic Armageddon, triggered perhaps by accident. When the Security Council meets today, it will consider a resolution which the United States has offered to seek to lessen the chances of such a holocaust.

The resolution grows out of the recent Soviet protest to the Security Council over United States bomber flights. It recognizes that the Soviets have a legitimate cause for anxiety about such flights which could be allayed if both sides joined in a system of international inspection.

What is proposed is very simple. It is that the whole area north of the Arctic Circle be constituted a northern zone of international inspection under the U. N., for the purpose of preventing either side from launching surprise attacks against each other. The nations involved, beside ourselves and the Soviet, are Canada, Finland, Sweden, Denmark (through Greenland), and Norway.

It is very heartening that all of these nations, save the Soviet, which has not yet responded, have expressed deep interest in the proposal.

Some observers have praised Ambassador Lodge's proposal as a clever psychological blow in the cold war; others have assumed that the Soviet will automatically use its veto to kill the plan. We believe both these views to be mistaken.

In the first place, Ambassador Lodge is in dead earnest in his hope to persuade the Soviets to cooperate in some phase of disarmament, however limited. This particular proposal was rejected by the Soviets last August when it was offered as part of a much larger plan, which included "open skies" mutual air reconnaissance.

But since then it is the Soviets themselves who have asked the U. N. to take steps to prevent bomber flights which possibly could trigger off a war. It is because they have opened up this subject that Mr. Lodge has renewed this one proposal, in a limited form, which the Soviets can easily accept if they are really in earnest in seeking to reduce the possibilities of an accidental war.

Moreover, he has left it flexible, so that if for any reason they are reluctant to open up all their Arctic area to inspection, the area can be limited to whatever they are willing to accept.

Because this subject is so terribly important to all peoples, we think it wrong to assume that the Soviets will veto it, in a kind of Pavlovian reflex against any Western proposal. They may very well seek to amend it, by adding all sorts of other proposals. But at least that would have the effect of keeping the matter under discussion, and allowing its merits to emerge.

Whatever happens it is refreshing to see Ambassador Lodge taking this positive, imaginative and constructive position. He has kept the discussion, from the time the Russians first raised the issue, free of all the charged, propagandistic language that has

come to be associated, on both sides, with the cold war. This is a deadly serious matter and he is wise in keeping it free of gimmickry. Let us hope the Soviets rise to a similar plane of sober, responsible discussion.

DR. RICHARD E. MCARDLE AND NATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE LEAGUE CAREER AWARDS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, all too seldom do we note the achievements of the career people in our Federal agencies. I should like to insert in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post listing 10 people who have been named by the National Civil Service League to receive career service awards.

I would not want to single out any one of these persons as more deserving than the next, but because the national forests are so important in my State, I am more familiar with operations of the Forest Service than with other Federal agencies. Dr. Richard E. McArdle, Chief of the United States Forest Service, typifies the devoted service that all members of the Forest Service give to the public. In the case of Dr. McArdle, the award has a meaning which I am sure is applicable to some of the other persons who were honored. His achievement was made possible by the outstanding service his associates have given over the years. This devotion to duty has earned for the United States Forest Service the respect and admiration of the public, the Congress, State and local officials, and the users of the national forest such as timbermen, stockmen, and miners. It is a blue-ribbon agency of Government.

I want to extend to each and every one of these people my warm congratulations for a record of service that redounds to the credit of our Government and to our form of government. Our Federal civil service is the key link in the effectiveness of our Government. I wish that more public notice could be given of the great accomplishments for better government that all of our Federal employees make.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with my remarks, the following article from the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVEN IN AREA WIN CAREER AWARDS

Ten civil service employees, including seven from the Washington area, have been named by the National Civil Service League to receive career service awards for "competence, efficiency, character, and continuity of service."

The awards, established by the league in 1955 to honor outstanding career civil service employees, will be presented next Monday at a dinner at the Sheraton-Park. The dinner also will mark the 75th anniversary of the first civil service law. Speakers will include Democratic National Chairman Paul Butler and Republican National Chairman Meade Alcorn.

The National Civil Service League, founded in 1881 as a nonpartisan civil organization dedicated to improving Government career service, selected the winners from 100 nominations submitted by 31 Federal agencies.

The recipients are:

Harry J. Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, who has been in Government service for 41 years. Active in curbing illicit nar-

cotics traffic, he was cited for being an able administrator and for "assuring the United States of an adequate flow of medicinal narcotics in war and peace."

William D. Carey, of 3724 Northampton Street NW., executive assistant to the Director of the Budget, who has spent all his 16 years of Government service in the Bureau. He was cited for "outstanding achievements in the Labor and Welfare Division and in special assignments, notably the coordination of scientific and technical activities."

Ewan Clague, of 3821 Woodley Road NW., Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor. Clague, who has been in Government service 18 years, was cited for "increasing the scope and accuracy of statistical programs of the Labor Department."

Hugh L. Dryden, of 5806 Overlea Road NW., Director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. In Government service for 40 years, Dryden has directed the NACA since 1947. The award described him as an "outstanding scientist-administrator whose personal growth from laboratory assistant to director shows the possibilities of a Federal career."

Richard E. McArdle, of 2907 Rittenhouse Street NW., Chief of the United States Forest Service. McArdle, who has been in Government service for more than 20 years, was cited for "his work in conservation, made possible by friendly and effective cooperation between the industry, the States and the Federal Government."

James O. Riley, of Edgewater, Md., general economist, Post Office Department Bureau of Transportation. In Government service for 33 years, Riley was cited for "his outstanding performance in an extremely technical area of transportation costs and expenditures." Riley started as a laboratory apprentice with the Bureau of Standards and served with the Interstate Commerce Commission before joining the Post Office 10 years ago.

Marjorie M. Whiteman, of 5021 Glenbrook Road NW., legal adviser, State Department Office of Inter-American Affairs. Miss Whiteman, who has been in Government service for 27 years, was cited for her "keen insight into the political as well as the legal aspects" of problems in international law and Latin American politics.

Robert M. Ball, of Baltimore, Deputy Director, Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In Government service for more than 15 years, Ball was cited for "his ability to lead and inspire those who work with him," and for "outstanding efficiency and notable public service."

John M. Ide, of near New London, Conn., technical director, Underwater Sound Laboratory, Navy Department. Ide, who has spent his 17 years of Government service in the Navy Department, was cited for achievements in electronic research and development.

Livingston T. Merchant, Ambassador to Canada. Merchant, in Government service for 16 years, was cited for his work in the State Department. The award noted that "the highest Government officials have come to rely heavily on his judgment in dealing with many of the most crucial problems."

AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION AND WILDERNESS PRESERVATION BILL

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a few days ago I presented for the record an extensive analysis of the wilderness preservation bill (S. 1176), of which I am a cosponsor. I have given my support to wilderness preservation legislation because of a sincere belief that a portion of our outdoor heritage should

be dedicated and maintained in its natural state.

Those of us who are supporting wilderness preservation recognize that there is not complete unanimity about the wisdom of this policy. Some groups and individuals believe that S. 1176 runs contrary to the multiple-use concept for management of public lands. Many of those holding such views are sincere and articulate advocates of natural resource conservation. They certainly deserve to have their objections and criticisms of the legislation made a matter of public record, even though they run contrary to the position of those, like myself, who maintain an opposite viewpoint. They have a right to be heard.

I have received a copy of a letter from Mr. Kenneth B. Pomeroy, chief forester of the American Forestry Association, to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. MURRAY], voicing the objections of that organization to features of the wilderness preservation bill. Although I do not agree with the conclusions, in the interests of fairness, I ask consent to include in the RECORD with my remarks the letter from Mr. Pomeroy outlining the association's action on this matter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1958.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Your thoughtfulness in advising us of the error in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding the wilderness bill is appreciated greatly.

Committee print No. 2, now being considered as a replacement for the earlier wilderness bill, S. 1176, was reviewed by the directors of the American Forestry Association at their February 24, 1958, board meeting. The directors said:

"Examination of this document reveals that it still contains the features initially objected to by the American Forestry Association as incompatible with the basic principle of multiple use of forest resources: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the American Forestry Association in accord with its action of July 6, 1956, is opposed to the proposals in committee print No. 2."

Mr. Chairman, the American Forestry Association is deeply concerned over this threat to the multiple-use concept of national forest management. Not only is it an open invitation to all other special interests to hew out their coveted portions of the public lands but it creates a council that could become a publicity group to propagandize the public at taxpayer expense.

These demands by wilderness enthusiasts come at a time when all conservationists should join together in strengthening the Nation's forest resources. Instead conservation organizations, trade associations, and public agencies have been split right down the middle. Many leaders on both sides deplore this situation. We would like to see the breach healed.

The American Forestry Association believes that wilderness is an intrinsic part of the Nation's heritage. It is something that is precious and should be preserved. We believe it is being preserved capably by ex-

listing agencies who at the same time are attempting to maintain all other important uses of the public lands in balance.

We recognize that some of the guidelines under which the Forest Service operates are based upon departmental regulations and that they should be strengthened by Congressional recognition of their importance.

Therefore the American Forestry Association recommends, earnestly, that legislation along the following lines be considered:

"That it is the policy of Government that all the resources of the public lands shall be so managed, conserved, utilized, and developed as to assure maximum public multiple use thereof; that public use for purposes of recreation, including wilderness enjoyment, hunting and fishing is a beneficial and proper use of such lands; that the development and maintenance of such areas and facilities, including maintenance of wilderness areas, is a proper function of the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior for their respective Departments."

We are sending copies of this letter to many other organizations that participated in the hearings of last June and inviting them to join with us in this constructive action.

Thank you very much for again permitting us to voice our thoughts.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH B. POMEROY,
Chief Forester.

THE IMPORTANCE OF COMMON-SENSE COOPERATION IN PRIVATE FUND RAISING FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on many occasions I have expressed the view that one of the greatest features of the American system is the voluntary habit of private initiative. I repeat, private initiative. What is needed now is a rebirth of private initiative, not simply a course of action that looks to Uncle Sam for everything. Americans should adhere to their habit of looking after the needs of fellow citizens through voluntary private channels. The volunteer on the American scene is not the unique person he is on the world scene.

DE TOCQUEVILLE'S SAGE OBSERVATIONS

The great French observer, Alexis De Tocqueville, writing about America in the early days of our freedom, made a significant statement. I stress it because here was a Frenchman diagnosing America. That is what we need now. We need a diagnosis of America, and not a lot of generalities. We have got to look into what our ills are and find a remedy for them. Listen to what this Frenchman said more than 100 years ago:

These Americans are the most peculiar people in the world. You'll not believe it when I tell you how they behave. In a local community in their country, a citizen may conceive of some need which is not being met.

I emphasize "a citizen." I continue reading:

What does he do? He goes across the street and discusses it with his neighbor. Then what happens? A committee comes into existence, and then the committee begins functioning on behalf of that need, and you won't believe this but it's true. All of this is done without reference to any bureaucrat. All of this is done by the private citizens on their own initiative. * * * The

health of a democratic society may be measured by the quality of functions performed by private citizens.

"By private citizens"—that is the key.

This very apt quotation, I may say, is carried in the March 1958 issue of the bulletin *Looking Ahead*, issued by the National Planning Association. The association itself is a fine example of private citizens working together to try to foresee the needs of our dynamic country, and to meet these needs.

SIX AND THREE-FOURTHS BILLION DOLLARS IN PRIVATE PHILANTHROPY

In 1957, alone, it is estimated that no less than \$6.7 billion was raised by United States private philanthropy. This is, possibly, about 44 percent of all the funds raised in the world for this purpose.

There is included in this United States figure the vast philanthropic amounts raised for private education, for religion, for health, and for a wide variety of other purposes.

Throughout the American scene are a vast number of voluntary organizations—National, State, and local—dedicated to the cause of serving the needs of their fellow men. In 1957, perhaps 37 million Americans—1 in 5 of our population—gave of time and talent to common causes.

Inevitably, the question arises: How best can funds be raised for meeting demonstrated needs? The consensus is that it has long been found that the community chest and related forms of united fund raising usually provide the most efficient method for raising funds with the comparatively least waste of manpower, time, and resources. Yet there has been a perennial controversy between worthy groups which, for a variety of reasons, did not feel they could join in the united fund raising.

It is not my purpose, today, to attempt to offer any arbitrary solution to this difficulty. I know that fine civic leaders who have dedicated countless man-hours to this problem fail to see eye to eye on it. So this is not a matter for recrimination. On the contrary, it is a matter to be worked out with common sense and cooperation.

No doubt there are individual instances of an independent drive, or drives, being indeed justified; although it is to be hoped that such independent drives will not multiply indefinitely, lest the whole concept of united giving be destroyed.

The women of the United States, in particular, number among our finest volunteers. It is upon their shoulders that much of the burden falls; particularly in such fields which have long been the special interest of women as the needs of children, the needs of schools, the needs of welfare.

FINE AID FROM BUSINESS AND LABOR

But our menfolk, as well, likewise find an increasing amount of time necessary to be devoted to problems of this nature. I mean men in labor and in management.

American corporations in my own and other States have been most generous—not only in their donation of money, but in their contribution of the time of their executives. Likewise, the AFL-CIO has

been generous in the cooperation of individual unions and union leadership.

The present recession, while it has diminished some collections, has not deterred the enthusiasm of countless public-spirited citizens in fulfilling De Tocqueville's observations.

At this time, here in our own community, Government workers are contributing to one fine package of national health and other organizations. I hope that the collection will be a great success.

FINE CONFERENCE HERE IN WASHINGTON

I send to the desk an item which illustrates the cooperative approach I have in mind.

It consists of the splendid program of the Health and Welfare Council in our Nation's Capital, which, on May 16, holds its ninth annual conference. It will be addressed by one of the great voluntary, yes, official, leaders at the grassroots of America, the Honorable Charles P. Taft.

I think this program, with its high caliber of speakers, panelists and participants, gives a fine example of what is being done by volunteers throughout this land. I am glad that our Nation's Capital has the Health and Welfare Council as a part of the United Givers Fund. I hope Washington, D. C., will always provide inspiration and an example for volunteers to communities across the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the conference leaflet be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the leaflet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE WILL WE BE IN 1963?—YOUR INVITATION, ANNUAL HEALTH, WELFARE, AND RECREATION CONFERENCE, HOTEL STATLER, FRIDAY, MAY 16, 1958

Luncheon meeting, 12:15 p. m.

Hon. Charles P. Taft, mayor of Cincinnati, Ohio, 1955-57. Outstanding volunteer leader in local and national welfare, civic, and church activities. Will speak on "Social Work, Housing, and Urban Renewal."

Sponsored by the Health and Welfare Council of the National Capital Area. Caesar L. Aiello, president; Isadore Seeman, executive director.

(Morning sessions)

1. Where will we be in 1963 in serving families under stress?

What are we doing about the high cost of unhappy living; families in crisis?

Chairman, Mrs. Francis G. Smith, Jr., member of the Fairfax and Falls Church, Va., HWC regional committee.

Panel, Our Changing Way of Life, G. Franklin Edwards, Ph. D., associate professor of sociology, Howard University.

The Added Stress of Low Income, Jay L. Roney, Director, Bureau of Public Assistance, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Homemaker Service, a New Local Resource, Mrs. Ernest G. Warren, president, Homemaker Service Agency of the National Capital area.

A Trial Balance on Services, Mrs. Ezekiel G. Stoddard, member of the board, Family and Child Services, Washington, D. C.

2. Where will we be in 1963 in serving children without homes?

Chairman, Mrs. A. Remigius Lash, member of the board, Alexandria Family Service.

Panel, Mrs. A. L. Spencer, vice chairman, HWC Committee on Children Without Homes; member, District of Columbia Board of Education.

Mrs. Elizabeth H. Ross, Director, HWC Junior Village project; former Deputy Chief, United States Children's Bureau.

Mrs. D. Elaine Starbuck, director, welfare board, Prince Georges County, Md.

Raymond F. Gould, Ph. D., social science analyst, Professional Services Branch, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md.

3. Where will we be in 1963 in understanding and treating alcoholism?

The rate of alcoholism in the National Capital area is one of the highest in the Nation with major implications in family disruption, economic loss and community health problems.

Chairman, Hon. Leonard P. Walsh, chief judge, Municipal Court.

Panel, Frank S. Ketcham, chairman, subcommittee on alcoholism, the American Bar Association.

Anthony Zappala, M. D., Chief, Alcohol Rehabilitation Division, District of Columbia Department of Public Health.

Mrs. Dorothee F. Mindlin, chief clinical psychologist, Alcohol Rehabilitation Division, District of Columbia Department of Public Health.

Mr. Henry Roberts, Alcoholics Anonymous.

4. Where will we be in 1963 in new patterns for family recreation?

Chairman, Mrs. Priscilla Urner, consultant, department of parks and recreation, Arlington County, Va.

Speaker, Robert T. Bower, Ph. D., director, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D. C.

Panel, Use of Parks and Open Space, Theodore T. Smith, manager, Prince William Forest Park, Virginia.

Family Camping, Ira L. Gibbons, acting dean, School of Social Work, Howard University.

YMCA Family Center. Indian Springs Club. Allen L. Cavaness, principal, Glen Haven Elementary School and program director, Silver Spring, Md., branch YMCA.

(Afternoon sessions)

A film festival; follow-up discussions of morning sessions.

NINETEEN FIFTY-EIGHT HWC ANNUAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

Cochairmen: Mrs. Theodore O. Wedel, vice president at large, National Council of Churches; chairman, HWC forum planning committee; Edwin Tribble, city editor, the Evening Star, chairman, HWC Public Relations Committee.

Members: Mrs. Nelson Blechman, member of the board, Hillcrest Children's Center; Mrs. Richard Bolling, member of the board, Friendship House; Donald Brewer, deputy director, District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare; Harmon Elder, assistant manager, regional public relations, Safeway Stores; Mrs. Elizabeth Goldfaden, executive director, Social Service League of Prince Georges County; George W. Howard, chief deputy probation officer, United States District Court, District of Columbia; Joseph Leverenz, executive director, District of Columbia chapter, American Cancer Society; Mrs. Ernest K. Lindley, member of the boards, the Ionia Whipper Home and the Washington Urban League; Mrs. Edwin McElwain, secretary, board of managers, Children's Convalescent Hospital; William J. McManus, vice president, public relations, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; Mrs. Walter J. Moore, member of the board, Catholic Charities of Northern Virginia; Mrs. Robert W. Shackleton, newsletter editor, American Institute of Architects; Mrs. Norman Taub, member HWC Forum Planning Committee; Austin Van der Slice, Ph. D., professor of sociology and anthropology, the American University; Mel White, information officer, United States Air Force; Mrs. John W. Whitten, member of the board, Visiting Nurse Association; Joseph Zatman, public

information officer, Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission.

Chairman of conference volunteers: Mrs. Calvin H. Cobb, Jr., placement chairman, Junior League of Washington.

(For information call Virgil Shinker, Decatur 2-7330, 1101 M Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in my opinion, this is a very clear demonstration of what is needed in America today, which is the awakening of the conscience of the various communities to the challenge which is facing us, and the awakening of the conscience of those who have vision and means to realize the needs of the communities and actually to take care of them.

I referred heretofore to an instance which occurred in my own State when I was a boy. A great sawmill went out of business, and the atmosphere was so thick with discouragement, fear and doubt that one could have cut it with a knife. Two Polish boys, Andrewjeski and Petrowski, began to make shoes. The citizens did not fall asleep. They could not turn to Washington or to any place else. As de Tocqueville had suggested, they called a committee together and sat down to analyze the situation. They got together a little money, and they started shoe factories. Pretty soon there were more shoe factories. Today that town does \$25 million worth of business in producing shoes, because the old enterprise of American citizens was evident in their getting together, working together and contributing together to help those who needed work. To me that is what is needed in America today.

I do not discount the activity of our Government in providing jobs in the form of public opportunities, but I believe the time has come when all of us must recognize our individual responsibilities as citizens of the communities in which we live to take care of the situation. This is a Nation of some 170 million people in 48 States, stretching across 3,000 miles, and no government, no matter how able it is, can take care of that vast situation. The Government can, as Lincoln said, "do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot by individual effort, do at all, or do so well, for themselves."

LAW DAY, U. S. A.—A REMINDER OF AMERICAN RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, tomorrow, May 1, has been proclaimed by the President as Law Day, U. S. A. The purpose of this fine observance is: First, to strengthen the Nation's dedication to the rule of law as the foundation of our free society; and second, to freshen every American citizen's awareness of the rights and privileges he enjoys by reason of our system of law.

Our Nation's basic strength lies in the laws which protect the individual rights of its citizens. Under our system of law, everyone is entitled to his day in court. Naturally, courts must be fully respected if they are to function effectively.

The American citizen has a great many rights and privileges unknown to

citizens of other lands. However, I do not believe that any American citizen has the right to take these guaranties for granted. We must all cherish our great American system. We must know what it is and what it represents. Frequently there are attempts—some intentional, and some unintentional—to undermine various aspects of our legal system. However, it is well to remember that our present system was drafted by far-sighted individuals who wisely wrote into the Constitution a system of checks and balances between the judicial, the legislative, and the executive branches of our Government.

In order to recognize any attempts to subvert our American legal system, we must first have a thorough understanding of what is embodied in that system.

I take this opportunity to commend President Eisenhower for his wisdom in proclaiming Law Day, U. S. A. I also congratulate the American Bar Association for its fine educational program in this and in many other connections.

I urge all citizens of our Nation to take advantage of this occasion to further their knowledge of the great benefits they receive under American law.

I send to the desk a copy of the President's proclamation, together with statements on the importance of Law Day from several Cabinet members and Government officials. I request that these statements be included with my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"Whereas it is fitting that the people of this Nation should remember with pride and vigilantly guard the great heritage of liberty, justice, and equality under law which our forefathers bequeathed to us; and

"Whereas it is our moral and civic obligation as free men and as Americans to preserve and strengthen that great heritage; and

"Whereas the principle of guaranteed fundamental rights of individuals under the law is the heart and sinew of our Nation, and distinguishes our governmental system from the type of government that rules by might alone; and

"Whereas our Government has served as an inspiration and a beacon light for oppressed peoples of the world seeking freedom, justice, and equality for the individual under laws; and

"Whereas universal application of the principle of the rule of law in the settlement of international disputes would greatly enhance the cause of a just and enduring peace; and

"Whereas a day of national dedication to the principle of government under laws would afford us an opportunity better to understand and appreciate the manifold virtues of such a government and to focus the attention of the world upon them;

"Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Thursday, May 1, 1958, as Law Day. I urge the people of the United States to observe the designated day with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I especially urge the legal profession, the press, and the radio, television, and motion-picture industries to promote and to participate in the observance of that date."

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 3d day of February in the year of our Lord 1958, and of the independence of the United States of America the 182d.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 3, 1958.

By the President:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, April 14, 1958.

Mr. CHARLES S. RHYNE,
President, American Bar Association,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RHYNE: Thank you for your letter of March 31. I congratulate the American Bar Association on its efforts on behalf of the national observance of Law Day, U. S. A., and hope that the occasion will be a successful one.

In international affairs it is impossible to sustain a just and lasting peace unless that peace is based upon law and order. Indeed, the universal acceptance of the principles of international law and morality is the indispensable requirement for the survival of our civilization.

Thus Law Day, U. S. A., is a meaningful occasion not only to our own country but to free men everywhere. It is a day on which Americans can rededicate themselves to the great concept of "equal justice under law."

I hope that my fellow countrymen will accept the President's urging and commemorate Law Day, U. S. A., in every appropriate way.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

STATEMENT BY HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
FOR USE IN THE OBSERVANCE OF LAW DAY,
U. S. A., MAY 1, 1958

President Eisenhower has proclaimed May 1, 1958 as Law Day, U. S. A.

At no time in our history has an understanding of the role of the rule of law in our land been more important. From the day the Constitution was ratified 169 years ago this Nation has subscribed to a system of laws, not men.

Law means order. It means that no person or crisis can shatter the orderly procedures by which we live. It means that the ultimate power of the Nation remains with its source, the people.

By living under the rule of law each individual and his fundamental rights are all important. Equal justice in the courts—the freedoms of the Bill of Rights—the opportunity to elect lawmakers * * * all have become accepted parts of each American's way of life.

Absent the rule of law in this Nation, this would not be true. We need only to look at those living behind the still rigid Iron Curtain to understand this.

Our system based on the rule of law will remain as strong as each person understands and rededicates himself to it.

Law Day, U. S. A., therefore, should be a time for every American to refresh himself with knowledge of our system of government by law. By so doing the day will not only be one of commemoration—it will be one of strengthening the force behind the law being honored.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY
ROBERT B. ANDERSON FOR USE DURING OBSERVANCE OF LAW DAY, U. S. A., ON MAY 1, 1958

The world today is at a crucial point in the struggle between freedom and tyranny. On the one side are those who hold to the principle of individual human freedom

under the rule of law as the inherent right of every man; on the other side stand the forces of darkness who would deny freedom and exalt the state. It is fitting and proper that this special day be set aside to commemorate our great heritage of liberty, justice, and equality under law so that it may echo and re-echo throughout the world and break through the curtain of darkness until these principles are accepted by all peoples and all nations.

ROBERT B. ANDERSON.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, April 7, 1958.

LAW DAY, U. S. A., MAY 1, 1958

By proclamation of the President, May 1, 1958, has been designated Law Day, U. S. A., and an occasion for special recognition of our national dedication to the principle of government under laws.

It is most appropriate for representatives of the Department of Defense to take particular note of this day and to join wholeheartedly in its observance. A powerful element of the strength of this Nation, to the defense of which our Armed Forces are dedicated, is our people's unflagging devotion to the rule of law, both domestically and internationally. Not only much of our strength but much of our purpose stems from the moral force of this feature of our way of life.

Accordingly, I urge military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense and the Armed Forces to participate in every appropriate way in Law Day, U. S. A., activities. In most cases, this probably can be done most effectively through cooperation with State and community bar associations, as by accepting invitations for speaking appearances or for service on Law Day, U. S. A., committees.

Finally, I would emphasize that while Law Day, U. S. A., is naturally of special import to military and civilian members of the legal profession, it is by no means merely a lawyer's day. Rather does it furnish us all an opportunity to express our devotion to the principle that law shall have precedence over force in the affairs of men.

NEIL McELROY.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1958.
LAW DAY, U. S. A.

President Eisenhower has proclaimed May 1, 1958, as Law Day, U. S. A., and has urged the people of the United States to observe the designated day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Many civic, professional, religious, and patriotic organizations are expected to join in various observances or special programs of this day. The American Bar Association is sponsoring special observances and local bar associations throughout the communities of the Nation are planning to present programs or to assist schools and other organizations in special observances.

I deem it most fitting that this event be given special mention in this Department and that it be drawn to the attention of all personnel, perhaps by the circulation of this message.

The aims of this Department are founded, of course, by law, and we carry out an important segment of the will of the people for a prosperous and happy land, expressed through statutes and protected by the courts. As you will be informed in the various observances of Law Day, U. S. A., the enjoyment of the freedom and abundance of this land is only possible through the order and security guaranteed by the laws of free men. The employees of this Department, I am sure, need only reflect briefly to realize that every act they perform is living evidence of

the existence and indispensability of our constitutional government.

I have asked the General Counsel to suggest to his attorneys in the field that they cooperate with local bar associations in programs or observances of Law Day, U. S. A. Likewise, if personnel of other agencies are called upon to assist in these observances, they should be encouraged to participate.

EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary.

LAW DAY STATEMENT OF HARRIS ELLSWORTH,
CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

On the observance of Law Day, May 1, 1958, the Civil Service Commission salutes the many men and women of our land who are concerned with the formulation, administration, and enforcement of the laws of this Nation, and it congratulates the American Bar Association and its affiliates for sponsoring this observance.

The more than 2 million members of the Federal civil service are directly concerned with upholding and administering the laws of this Nation. Each is at his particular station because some law or laws, enacted by the Congress in response to the will of the American people, requires the performance of his special duties.

It is appropriate that we set aside this day to give honor to the law and to recall that while ours is a Government of, by, and for the people, it is a Government of laws, not of men. And it is likewise appropriate during this 75th anniversary of the Civil Service Act of 1883 that all of us in the Federal service rededicate ourselves to uphold the law in our service to this Nation and its citizens.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
Washington, D. C., April 15, 1958.
LAW DAY, U. S. A.

The foundation stone of our American system of Government is respect for the law. Over the years, men and women have fought, suffered, and died that the concept of constitutional law might reign supreme. They had seen tyranny first hand—a tyranny that robbed them of their individual liberties or prevented their worship of God. These courageous people came to our shores, determined that the candle of liberty was based on this respect for the law, not on the whimsical desires of men. To that end they dedicated their lives.

Today, as we see the menacing shadows of a Communist world empire, we must be ever more dedicated to our free way of life. Communism would deprive us of our constitutional liberties. Communism is dictatorial. It is atheistic. It is deceitful. In communism, the individual exists only to serve the state. He is a mere pawn of the party. Law is what the Communist dictator says it is. The rights of the individual are purely fictitious.

Law Day, U. S. A., should make us conscious of our great obligations to law and order. It should serve to remind us that we exist as free men because only under law can individual rights prosper. Never must we forget this.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

LIMITATION OF APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, today the Judiciary Committee voted to report favorably S. 2646, with amendments. To the best of my limited ability, I have vigorously opposed this bill and its

amendments since their earliest consideration by the committee.

During the past few weeks, I have received several communications from outstanding persons who are learned in the law, and from several organizations, respecting this bill and the amendments. All these communications, with the exception of one, are opposed to the enactment of S. 2646 and the amendments. I believe that all Members of the Senate will find these communications most interesting. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the communications be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHICAGO BAR ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., April 25, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNING, JR.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNING: At its meeting on Thursday, April 24, 1958, the board of managers considered and approved the enclosed report from the association's committee on Federal legislation concerning S. 2646 (Jenner bill), H. R. 9207 and H. R. 10775. As you know, when our board of managers approves a report of one of our committees, the position stated in the report becomes the position of the Chicago Bar Association.

Sincerely,

RICHARD H. CAIN,
Executive Secretary.

APRIL 21, 1958.

BOARD OF MANAGERS,
Chicago Bar Association,
Chicago, Ill.

GENTLEMEN: The Committee on Federal Legislation has had under study bills H. R. 10775, H. R. 9207, S. 2646. These bills, in general, provide for limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, establishing rules of interpretation of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws, and facilitating the admission of confessions in United States courts.

Bills H. R. 10775 (introduced by Representative COLMER), H. R. 9207 (introduced by Representative ST. GEORGE), and S. 2646 (introduced by Senator JENNER), would deny the Supreme Court jurisdiction to review the following:

1. Cases in which Congressional investigation panels have won convictions for contempt of Congress against witnesses who refused to answer questions.

2. Suspensions or dismissal of Government employees in the executive branch for security reasons.

3. Case in which local or State boards of education have dismissed teachers on security grounds.

4. Rules or regulations of any State authorities who refuse to license as lawyers, persons found unacceptable on security grounds.

Bills H. R. 9207 and S. 2646 (with identical provisions) in addition eliminate Supreme Court review of cases in which convictions have been made under State laws controlling subversive activities within the State. H. R. 10775 also provides a Federal act cannot occupy a legislative field to the exclusion of the State law unless it expressly so provides, that neither State nor Federal courts will be obliged to follow decisions of the Supreme Court where that Court fails to adhere to the principle of stare decisis and that confessions otherwise admissible shall not be inadmissible because of delay in taking the confessor before a United States commissioner.

The amendment to S. 2646 introduced by Senator BUTLER is in reality a substitute bill which retains the provisions of that bill in depriving the Supreme Court of its jurisdiction to review cases from State authorities denying admission of persons to practice before the bar, and in addition provides for the following:

1. A Congressional committee is final in its ruling of whether or not a question should be answered on the point of pertinency.

2. In certain sensitive security agencies, there could be no appeal from the authority to suspend without pay, certain employees found to be security risks.

3. A Federal act cannot occupy a legislative field to the exclusion of the State law, unless it expressly so provides (and this same provision is in H. R. 10775).

4. The Smith Act is amended so that advocating or teaching the overthrow or destruction of the Government is made a crime without regard to the immediate probable effect of such action.

After full consideration of the aforesaid bills, the Committee on Federal Legislation unanimously adopted the following motion on April 8, 1958:

Moved that a recommendation be made to the board of managers of this association that bills H. R. 10775, H. R. 9207 and S. 2646 be disapproved.

The committee adopted the aforesaid motion in the case of all the bills for the following reasons:

1. The independence of the Supreme Court is jeopardized if its jurisdiction can be curtailed because of the unpopularity of its decisions with certain Members of Congress.

2. The independence of courts is vital in order to preserve the constitutional and democratic form of Government under which we live.

3. Persons involved in litigation of the types that these bills cover are just as much entitled to review by the Supreme Court as other litigants, and to legislate specially as these bills do is discriminatory.

4. Curbing the Supreme Court's appellate jurisdiction in certain fields is contagious and will spread to other fields whenever decisions in those fields become politically unpopular.

5. The Bill of Rights of the Constitution is impaired by these bills which withdraw the protection of the Supreme Court in selected legislative areas since that Court is the ultimate guardian of constitutional liberties of individuals against arbitrary governmental action.

6. There is need for a common reviewing authority in order to resolve conflicting interpretations of law; otherwise, the constitutional rights of an American in one Federal circuit may well be different from the rights of another American in another Federal circuit.

7. A fundamental and essentially conservative influence in our Government could be placed at the mercy of unwise and rash political action.

The committee found H. R. 10775 additionally objectionable because some of its provisions have nothing to do with the Supreme Court's jurisdiction, and, as in the case of the Butler amendment, nothing to do with each other. If such matters are to be handled at all, they should be handled in separate bills.

In conclusion, the committee urges strongly upon the board of managers that these bills be defeated on account of their kill the umpire philosophy because their authors do not agree with certain decisions of the Supreme Court.

WILLIAM W. FULLAGAR,
Chairman, Committee on Federal
Legislation.

REPORT OF NEW YORK COUNTY LAWYERS ASSOCIATION OPPOSING PROPOSED BUTLER AMENDMENTS TO THE JENNER BILL (S. 2646)

The New York County Lawyers Association opposes the proposed Butler amendments to the Jenner bill (S. 2646). Our general basis of opposition is as follows:

1. The association opposed the original Jenner bill. The proposed Butler amendments retain the objectionable feature of withdrawing one important area of litigation from ultimate review in the Supreme Court because of disagreement with some decisions in the area. We regard this method of dealing with such matters as extremely undesirable and a direct attack on the independence of the judiciary. The organized bar has for many years favored a constitutional amendment which would preclude such tampering with the Supreme Court's appellate jurisdiction. The fact that the revised measure would withdraw only 1 area from ultimate review in the highest court, whereas the original Jenner bill withdraws 5, is only a difference in degree; the principle is equally objectionable. The organized bar opposes this attack on the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court even though many members of the bar agree with the dissenting opinions in recent cases involving admission to the bar. The way to cure alleged error is, we believe, by further presentation to the highest Court or by the direct method of constitutional amendment.

2. The attempt to legislate, broadly and without adequate consideration of extremely delicate and difficult particular problems, in order to change in the future the results of some decisions with which the authors of the legislation disagree, is objectionable because the legislation is not and cannot be sufficiently discriminating. The decisions involve very important questions of individual rights and governmental power, including the proper balance between the Nation and the States. Grave constitutional questions are presented. If any change is desirable or necessary, it should be very carefully worked out and should not be a mere incidental part of general legislation aimed in an omnibus way at a large number of decisions. Proposals relating to widely different subjects should not be included in one measure, but should each be considered separately.

We shall not attempt at this time to comment upon the particular decisions of the Supreme Court or the method of dealing with them, if they need to be dealt with at all, which are proposed in the Butler amendments. However, an example of need for more careful appraisal is presented by the method by which the Butler amendments attempt to deal with the result of the Watkins decision. In effect, the Butler proposal would withdraw from judicial review any question of the pertinency of any inquiry in the course of a Congressional investigation. It would leave all such questions to the unfettered discretion of those conducting the investigation. It is only natural that legislative committees will tend to resolve such questions in favor of the pertinency of the questions to their investigations. The need for independent judicial review in such circumstances is evident. If there is need for legislation in connection with such investigations, Congress might well address itself to consideration of the adoption of a code of fair procedure in Congressional investigations, long recommended by the organized bar, rather than relieving such inquiries from any independent scrutiny. Congress might also give thought to such measures as the Keating bill (H. R. 259) favored by the American Bar Association, which would permit prompt resort to the courts for rulings upon questions of pertinency.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW,
Bloomington, Ind., April 8, 1958.
The Honorable THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of April 3, 1958, and the material on the amendments proposed by Senator BUTLER.

I am in complete agreement with your opposition to the omnibus approach of the proposals. They are wide-ranging, complex, and demand thorough study individually, since they do not cohere in a consistent single policy, but manifest several distinct policies.

The proposal to amend title 28 with respect to State regulation of admission to the bar is the subject of one part of my memorandum of March 24, 1958. Limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court in this way would almost certainly mean in the vast majority of cases not merely the exercise by Congress of its constitutional power to make exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of the Court, but a violation of the constitutional injunction to vest all of the judicial power of the United States in the Federal courts, as explained in *Martin v. Hunter's Lessee* (1 Wheat. 304). Even if it were constitutional, it would be unwise to the point of creating chaos, thus to erect 48 supreme courts administering Federal issues in this class of cases as the supreme law of the land. What kind of supremacy could obtain in a situation where even 1 State supreme court could finally determine an issue of Federal law in conflict with the determinations of that issue by one or more of the other 47?

The proposal to make refusal to answer impertinent questions propounded to witnesses before Congress a crime by process of waiver through failure to make timely objection and through failure to appeal requires careful study. The due process clause of the fifth amendment would seem to require that if the gist of the offense is waiver combined with refusal to answer, there must be adequate procedure by which waiver is in substance and fact the deliberate relinquishment of a known right, with a fair opportunity to avoid waiver as by a fiction. If this is so, the proposal is deficient in that it lacks specification of right to object and right to appeal. That is, the remedies internal to the Congress are not spelled out. The Congress, on the other hand, should be careful in binding its own hands procedurally in judicializing its committee procedures. Legislative investigations about their own purposes when they are converted into trials. Against these costs in terms of formalizing legislative investigations should be weighed the ultimate utility of imposing criminal punishment for refusal to answer a question to which the power of Congress to compel an answer is ultimately judged lacking.

The proposal to expand the categories of so-called sensitive positions seems to me to call for extensive hearings. The executive branch has more of a stake in this kind of determination than the Congress, and it should be heard in the process of weighing civil-service tenure policy against antisubversion policy. (I do not mean to suggest that the Congress is not the ultimate repository of power to make this kind of decision, but only that Congress ought to consider the advice of executive officers in making plans for civil-service tenure. For example, Congress in acting on such advice might wish to specify standards by which heads of departments or the President himself classifies positions as sensitive, thereby modifying the doctrine of the Cole case in the direction of making the classification more of an executive-legislative judgment than a function of the courts.)

I can add little to your discussion of the problem of Federal occupation of the field,

except to point out that the issue as drawn by the proposal of Senator BUTLER is highly multifarious. It is one kind of problem in safety regulation, another in certificate of convenience and necessity licensing, another in door-to-door canvassing regulations, another in prescribing limits of weight, size, and loading of highway vehicles, another in plant disease inspection, another in harbor regulations of marine equipment and use, etc. Congress should consider sedition against the States in its own setting, in order to get at the problem of cooperation between Federal and State law enforcement officers and the issue of double punishment for the same conduct, if the Nelson decision is to be legislatively modified (for future cases, of course). There are several alternatives that could be explored here, among which might be removal of the State case to the Federal courts, with or without vesting discretion in the Department of Justice to dismiss the prosecution (to protect its investigative apparatus, for example). This is another area in which hearings should be employed to get advice from the administration and the benefit of the experience of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and State and other Federal law enforcement agencies concerned with sedition, espionage, and sabotage.

There should also be hearings on the proposals contained in section 5 of the amendments. Offhand, it appears that the distinction between advocacy as teaching abstract doctrine and advocacy as incitement to action is, however subtle and difficult to grasp, one that inheres in the dictionary meaning of advocacy and in the constitutional limitations upon Congressional power imposed by the first amendment. Even if the finding in paragraph (a) is a proper discharge of legislative function, the simplistic abolition of the distinction does not abolish the constitutional problem. Presumably the first clause of paragraph (b) is intended to carry out the object stated in paragraph (a), but it is hardly a fortunate piece of draftsmanship. Does it mean that the law is more concerned with remote than with proximate consequences in determining the criminality of conduct or of intent? If so, we are proceeding on a principle that would make attempts more serious crimes than completed offenses. I am certain, therefore, that this is not the meaning of the qualification, but I am at a loss to suggest alternative meanings. If this clause is as vague as it seems to me to be, the object of paragraph (a) is defeated by it. I can add nothing to your discussion of paragraph (c), except to point out that it should be qualified in the same manner as paragraph (b) is qualified, however, that may be, if it is not to create an inconsistency in the statute. A provision along the lines of paragraph (d), with regard to organizational activity should be drawn in the light of the more general prohibitions of advocacy and abetting, and the more general prohibition of the conspiracy statute. After the holding in the Yates case, there is justification for legislative consideration of the relationship between conspiracy and organizational activities subsequent to initial organization. This consideration should, in my judgment, be disentangled from the other proposals of Senator BUTLER and should be deliberate, including public hearings.

Very truly yours,
IVAN C. RUTLEDGE,
Professor of Law.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
New York, N. Y., March 27, 1958.
Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Senate Judiciary Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: On March 4, 1958, the NAACP presented testimony against S. 2646, a bill which would seriously restrict

the power of the United States Supreme Court. At the time of our appearance, we also registered opposition to a proposal offered by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER of Maryland, which would expose lawyers who handle civil rights cases in the South to certain disbarment without a chance to appeal to the United States Supreme Court.

The sweeping provisions of S. 2646 make it a threat to orderly judicial procedure. We urge that you vote against it. We also urge that Senator BUTLER's proposal, which he offers as an amendment to S. 2646, be set aside until it can be considered on its own merits during hearings set for that purpose.

Sincerely yours,
CLARENCE MITCHELL,
Director, Washington Bureau.

LAW SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass., April 14, 1958.
Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: Thank you very much for your letter of April 9, and for your kindness in sending me a copy of your memorandum with respect to the so-called Butler amendments.

Your memorandum is excellent, and persuasive. I hope very much that the committee will not approve these amendments.

I noted in the papers the other day that you are making an inquiry with respect to the printing of the "Appendix IV to Part 2" to the hearings on the Jenner bill. This is the document which is called a Study by SPX Research Associates.

I was really rather shocked to find that this was printed under Government auspices. The fact that it came out as a separate item, not part of the regularly published hearings, aroused my curiosity. I hope that you will find out some more facts about this.

With best wishes,
Very truly yours,
ERWIN N. GRISWOLD, Dean.

YALE UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL,
New Haven, Conn., April 8, 1958.
Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: I am sorry that my telegram from Miami was so sketchy. I was late, and I was anxious to do what I could to help you in this extremely important fight you are leading to protect the very possibility of civil rights in this country. The groups which have mobilized to attack the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court are sinister and determined. I am sure that when the sensible, ordinary opinion of the country has been alerted, they will be defeated. I shall look over your impressive legal memorandum during the next few days to see whether I can add anything to it.

Meanwhile, let me thank you once again as a citizen and as a lawyer, for your most important leadership in this fight.

With great appreciation,
Yours sincerely,
EUGENE V. ROSTOW.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., April 3, 1958.
Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Just received your letter of March 27. I find Senator BUTLER's amendments to S. 2646 as objectionable as the original bill. Its passage would be a tragic blow to liberty under law. If the basic requirements of due process are important to any citizen as protection against the risk of arbitrary action by the State, they should be available to lawyers, to guarantee them against disbarment or refusals of admission on arbitrary capricious or unreasonable grounds. My views on the problems of the Cole case appear in Harpers magazine for July 1957. I

disagree with Senator BUTLER's proposal to change the rule in the Watkins case, which stands as a desirable reminder of the necessity for responsible exercise of the broad powers of Congressional committees. As for Yates and likes cases, the reasons for my disagreement with Senator BUTLER's proposals are developed at length in my article in Harvard Law Review for 1952. I see no need to revise the Nelson case. Such a step would promote a multiplicity of prosecutions and penalties in field to no good end.

EUGENE V. ROSTOW,
Dean, Yale Law School.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF LAW,

Bloomington, Ind., April 1, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNING, JR.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNING: I regret that I did not receive your letter of March 27 until yesterday evening. It seems to me that the proposals of Senator BUTLER are equally objectionable to those of S. 2646 and would achieve the same results by different methods.

In the first place, while I am sure all would join in wanting to do what was necessary to protect the traditions of this country from any totalitarianism, I believe that we should be most careful not to destroy the liberties we have enjoyed in doing it. Further, it seems to me that the matter of sedition is a matter for the Federal Government. Certainly, too, I cannot believe that the Congress would not wish to have proper limitations placed upon its investigatory powers.

I realize fully here that we are not necessarily dealing with constitutional questions but rather with the wise exercise of Congressional power in which there may be a wide field of disagreement. However, I believe that if careful study is made to the Butler proposals it could be shown that they might very well introduce as undesirable results as those which they would cure.

I would, therefore, oppose the Butler proposals for essentially the same reasons as I opposed S. 2646.

Sincerely yours,

LEON H. WALLACE, Dean.

ARKANSAS BAR ASSOCIATION,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
April 15, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNING, JR.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNING: Thank you for your letter of April 10 and enclosures with respect to the Butler amendment to S. 2646. You are correct in your impression that it will be impossible for our association or the executive committee thereof to take any action on the material before the next meeting of the Judiciary Committee on April 21.

While I am in sharp disagreement with a number of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and conscientiously share the views expressed by Judge Learned Hand and Mr. Alfred J. Schweppe in recent bar journals, I do not believe that the problem could be or should be solved by Congressional limitations on appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. While I lament, for the good of the United States and my own State of Arkansas, the unjustified overboard decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the recent past, I am unable to go along with the thought that the highest Court in the land should have its jurisdiction eroded away by legislation every time a bad decision is rendered.

You understand, of course, that the views expressed in this letter are personal, and I am not purporting to speak for the associa-

tion of which I am president, even though I may be secure that the overwhelming majority of our members share my views.

Incidentally, John G. Scott, of New York, and Fred Schlafly, of Alton, and Bob Schlafly, of St. Louis, are very good friends of mine.

With personal good wishes, I am

Sincerely,

EDWARD L. WRIGHT, President.

STATE BAR ASSOCIATION OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, Conn., April 15, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNING, JR.,
Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNING: I received your recent letter with your comments in respect to the Jenner bill and the Butler amendments last Saturday, and as it happened, the semiannual meeting of the board of delegates of the State Bar Association of Connecticut was held yesterday, Monday, April 14. At this meeting I was able to read your letter.

The board of delegates, which is the official decision-making body of our State Bar Association, by unanimous resolution placed itself on record as opposing any and all efforts to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States directly or indirectly because of disapproval of the decisions of that Court in a particular field or fields. The association also, through its board of delegates, directed that its action be communicated to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and I shall appreciate it if you will be kind enough to carry out this request.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES W. COOPER.

P. S.—Speaking personally, and as a Republican, I feel that this position of the bar association is completely nonpartisan, and for my own part, I find the proposed legislation to be the same type of legislation as the court-packing bill in the thirties. I'm happy to be able to be consistent in disapproval in all such similar instances for the same reasons.

J. W. C.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
March 31, 1958.

The Honorable THOMAS C. HENNING, JR.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNING: I have your letter of March 27 with reference to the Butler amendment to the Jenner bill. In my view, the opposition of the American Bar Association to Senator JENNER's bill, S. 2446, applies in principle to the proposed amendment of Senator BUTLER. What the American Bar Association really voted in favor of was an expression of opposition to any tampering with the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES S. RHYNE.

THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
New York, April 16, 1958.
The Honorable THOMAS C. HENNING, JR.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Sir: I am enclosing a copy of a letter written to Senator HENNING by Mr. Richard W. Hogue, Jr., in regard to S. 337 and a copy of a telegram to Senator HENNING expressing the opposition of this association to the Butler amendments.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL B. DEWITT.

HUGHES, HUBBARD, BLAIR & REED,
New York City, April 10, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNING, JR.,
Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

The committee on Federal legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York last night approved its chairman's letter of April 3 to you, but wishes to express its opposition to Senator BUTLER's proposals to Senator JENNER's bill in much stronger terms than contained in that letter. This necessarily includes opposition to S. 337. Neither Jenner bill nor amendments proposed by BUTLER should be reported out by Judiciary Committee. Certainly not without further extensive hearings on each aspect of bill and proposed amendments. Our committee of opinion that lawyers peculiarly qualified to express opinion on this type of legislation. If further hearings and Judiciary Committee so desires undersigned or secretary our committee or both happy to testify. Copies of this telegram and letter of April 3 being sent to all members Judiciary Committee.

RICHARD W. HOGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Federal
Legislation.

COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION,
ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK,
New York, April 3, 1958.

The Honorable THOMAS C. HENNING, JR.,
Committee on the Judiciary, United
States Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNING: Your letter of March 27 with which you enclose a copy of the mimeographed memorandum of Senator BUTLER containing proposed amendments to S. 2646 did not reach me until day before yesterday. Because of the press of other matters I have been unable to answer until now. If the newspaper reports concerning Attorney General Rogers' testimony before the committee are accurate I am in complete accord with his view that the proposed amendments of S. 2646 are of such a nature that the committee should make haste slowly in order that the implications of the respective proposals can be seriously studied in the light of the relevant Supreme Court decisions and the background of those decisions. The proposals would, in effect, overrule several of those decisions. Such a proposal to overrule a decision of the judiciary, a coordinate branch of the Federal Government, is a matter which requires grave consideration.

Illustrative of the type of consideration called for is that embodied in the reports of the committee on Federal legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York on the bills to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities, copies of which have been sent to the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, as well as to the individual members of those committees. Enclosed is an additional copy of those reports. The majority report, opposing such legislation, was overwhelmingly approved at a stated meeting of the members of the association on March 11, 1958.

The enclosed report is addressed to the specific area involved in *Pennsylvania v. Nelson* (350 U. S. 497 (1956)) and thus is not addressed to item (3) of Senator BUTLER's proposal. Senator BUTLER's proposal is similar to an earlier bill which was introduced in the last session of the 84th Congress and which was opposed by labor representatives, the railroads and the Attorney General, substantially upon the grounds that such legislation would result in con-

fusion in the fields of labor and railroad law and that the effects in other areas of the law could not be determined without study of each area of its application. Such studies of necessity would be exhaustive and time consuming. The Attorney General's recommendation was that each area be studied specifically in order to determine whether legislation was needed or advisable. He preferred specific legislation by separate bills rather than a shotgun approach. The former type of approach, in my judgment, is necessary in order that the committee and Congress be able to reach an intelligent, informed, and reasoned conclusion on the innumerable problems which would otherwise attend the enactment of a proposal such as that involved in item (3) in the memorandum of Senator BUTLER. For the foregoing reasons I believe that the enactment of item (3) would be unwise.

Time forbids my giving a serious study (such as was given in the enclosed report in the area of the Nelson case) to the areas involved in *Watkins v. United States* (354 U. S. 178 (1957)); *Cole v. Young* (351 U. S. 536 (1956)); and *Yates v. United States* (754 U. S. 298 (1957)). I am quite sure, however, that there are many lawyers who would defend these decisions as proper and many more lawyers who, whether or not they agreed with the decisions, would oppose Congressional action overruling them.

Even without serious study I would like to comment briefly upon the remainder of Senator BUTLER's proposals. Item (1) of the proposals deals with the decision in the *Watkins* case, in which the Supreme Court affirmed the unanimous reversal by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals of a conviction for contempt of Congress arising out of a refusal of a witness to testify before a Congressional investigating committee. Six Justices concurred in this decision, 1 Justice dissented, and 2 did not participate. Ten of the eleven Federal judges who participated in the case from the trial through the appellate stage agreed with the conclusion of the Supreme Court. The effect of the decision is merely to require a more specific procedure in the conduct of Congressional investigations where the constitutional rights of witnesses are concerned. The majority opinion points out (at p. 205) that:

"It is, of course, not the function of this Court to prescribe rigid rules for the Congress to follow in drafting resolutions establishing investigating committees. That is a matter peculiarly within the realm of the legislature, and its decisions will be accepted by the courts up to the point where their own duty to enforce the constitutionally protected rights of individuals is affected."

and again (at p. 215) that:

"We are mindful of the complexities of modern government and the ample scope that must be left to the Congress as the sole constitutional depository of legislative power. Equally mindful are we of the indispensable function, in the exercise of that power, of Congressional investigation. The conclusions we have reached in this case will not prevent the Congress, through its committees, from obtaining any information it needs for the proper fulfillment of its role in our scheme of government. The legislature is free to determine the kinds of data that should be collected."

In the light of these statements of the Supreme Court it would seem that the Congress should be equally mindful of the scope which should be afforded the Supreme Court in the protection of constitutional rights. Item (1) of the proposals under consideration appears to be aimed at making the Congress the final arbiter of the constitutional rights of witnesses at Congressional hearings. This function, in my judgment, is a judicial function which should be left in the hands

of the judiciary. Traditionally, the judicial branch of the Government has always been regarded as the appropriate branch to protect individual constitutional rights. In this connection I should point out that this item of the proposals is not restricted to testimony with respect to affiliation with any subversive organization. It might deprive any citizen of his constitutional right to free speech or to plead the Fifth Amendment, at the discretion of the Congress rather than the courts.

Item (2) of the proposals relates to the area of the *Cole* case, in which the Supreme Court held illegal the discharge from Federal employ of a food and drug inspector. The discharge had been based upon the finding that his continued employment was not "clearly consistent with the interest of national security." In reaching this result, the Court concluded that the statutory term "national security" was used in a limited sense, relating only to "those activities which are directly concerned with the Nation's safety, as distinguished from the general welfare," and held that no determination had been made that the position in question was connected with the "national security" as so interpreted. Only 3 of the 9 Supreme Court Justices dissented from that decision. Seven of the judges who participated in the case from the trial through the appellate stage agreed with the result reached by the Supreme Court. Six voted otherwise.

This item of the proposals falls within the legislative rather than the judicial function. The legislative issue is whether or not the summary provisions for discharge embodied in the existing statute (which is specifically applicable to the Departments of State, Commerce, Justice, Defense, Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Security Resources Board and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics) should be extended to cover all departments and agencies of the Government. In reaching a conclusion on this issue it is essential to balance the inadvisability of applying a summary method of dismissal to employees of the Federal Government in positions which might afford no real opportunity for injury to the security of the country. My conviction is as firm as that of any citizen of our country that there is no place in Federal employ for any person who is disloyal to our Nation. As Calvin Coolidge laconically put it, in substance: "We are all agin sin"—but "sin" has varying degrees of moral reprehensibilities and evil consequence. It is normally punished or sought to be prevented by measures adapted to the seriousness of the crime and of its consequences. Moreover, summary punishment or summary dismissal implies urgent necessity justifying a shortcut in normal procedures. It is more apt to result in injustices to specific individuals who are necessarily suspect because of the very nature of the charge against them and who frequently have the very onerous burden of proving an innocent mind.

Considerations such as the foregoing must enter into any decision on this particular item of the proposals. I do not feel that my profession as an attorney would lend any greater weight to my personal views than other personal views of any other citizen as to the desirability of enacting this item were I to devote more study to the matter than time permits. I have the utmost confidence that your committee will strike the appropriate balance in considering this item of the proposals.

Item (4) of the proposals under consideration deals with the area of the *Yates* case, in which the Court (1) held that the Smith Act did not prohibit "advocacy and teaching of forcible overthrow as an abstract principle, divorced from any effort to instigate

action to that end, * * * (354 U. S. at p. 318); and (2) construed the term organized in the Smith Act as limited to acts entering into the creation of a new organization and not including acts theretofore performed in carrying on organizational activities (354 U. S. at p. 310). As a result of this construction the statute of limitations was held to apply to the charges involved under this phase of the statute.

On the first aspect of item (4), that relating to the amendment of 18 U. S. C. 2385 so as to punish advocacy of the overthrow of the Government without regard to the existence of an immediate probable effect of such act, I shall content myself with calling to your attention and to the attention of the committee the classical language of Justice Holmes in his dissent (concurring in by Justice Brandeis) in *Abrams v. United States* (250 U. S. 616, at p. 630 (1919)):

"Persecution for the expression of opinions seems to me perfectly logical. If you have no doubt of your premises or your power and want a certain result with all your heart you naturally express your wishes in law and sweep away all opposition. To allow opposition by speech seems to indicate that you think the speech impotent, as when a man says that he has squared the circle, or that you do not care wholeheartedly for the result, or that you doubt either your power or your premises. But when men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market, and that truth is the only ground upon which their wishes safely can be carried out. That at any rate is the theory of our Constitution. It is an experiment, as all life is an experiment. Every year if not every day we have to wager our salvation upon some prophecy based upon imperfect knowledge. While that experiment is part of our system I think that we should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe and believe to be fraught with death, unless they so imminently threaten immediate interference with the lawful and pressing purposes of the law that an immediate check is required to save the country. * * *

Finally, the proposals of Senator BUTLER would leave unimpaired the provisions of S. 2646 which relate to admission of persons to the practice of law in State courts. The attempt here is to overrule the decisions of the Supreme Court in *Schwartz v. Board of Bar Examiners* (353 U. S. 232 (1957)) and *Konigsberg v. State Bar of California* (353 U. S. 252 (1957)).

The reasons advanced in opposition to S. 2646 in my letter to you of February 19, 1958, written on behalf of the Committee on Federal Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, are still applicable to this portion of the bill. For the reasons therein stated that committee is opposed in principle to legislation of this type.

Except for this last expression of views of the committee on Federal legislation I must characterize the statements and opinions expressed in this letter as personal with me. There is insufficient opportunity to secure my committee's views until our next meeting, which will take place on April 9. At that meeting I shall submit a copy of this letter for the consideration of the committee and will advise you of any action or expression of views on its part.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD W. HOGUE, Chairman.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Philadelphia, April 17, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNING, JR.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNING: I am grateful to you for your letter of March 31 and enclosures.

I heard today that the Committee on the Judiciary is scheduled to consider the Jenner bill and Senator BUTLER's proposed amendments to it next Monday. I hope most earnestly that the committee will reject the measure in its entirety, and I take this occasion to offer a few observations about the proposals of Senator BUTLER. As you know, I have already testified in opposition to the original Jenner bill.

At the outset, I must say that I find it well nigh unbelievable that a Senate committee consisting entirely of members of the legal profession could find enough merit in proposals such as these to dignify them, as has been done. The committee would do much better to devote its attention to means of making the rule of law in this country operate evenhandedly without regard to race, creed, or color than to attack the highest court in the land because of disagreement with some of its decisions. It is alien to the genius of American political thought and subversive of the American constitutional system to attack the institution and processes of one or another of the three coordinate branches of the National Government because you disagree with some of its decisions.

The proposals of Senator BUTLER would retain only one of the Jenner bill's projected limitations on the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, namely, that having to do with admission to the practice of law. That proposed limitation remains objectionable, as it has been from the outset. It is perfectly obvious that the Supreme Court has not taken over control of admission to the legal profession. What it has determined in two cases is related simply to whether or not the individuals involved had been denied the benefit of the protection of the 14th amendment. Certainly, admission to the legal profession must be administered consistently with the 14th amendment's equal protection of the law and due process of law clauses, just as must State and local governmental activity generally. A State rule which would deny access to the legal profession on the grounds of religion or race would be plainly unconstitutional and no act of Congress could change this. If there is any area in which the lawyers should be sharply sensitive to the ideas embodied in due process, it should be that of qualification for the practice of law.

The other proposals of Senator BUTLER have to do with disparate matters of substantive policy. They, thus, should not be thrown together in one bill, but should be considered separately. This is elementary from the standpoint of sound legislative practice.

As to the merits, I consider all four of the substantive proposals objectionable.

The proposal to meet the decision in the Watkins case is, as I understand it, designed to make a committee determination of the pertinency of a question put to a witness final for purposes of the contempt of Congress' criminal statute. Since a man's liberty may depend upon the question of pertinency, judicial review should not, in my opinion, be excluded. It is true that each house has contempt power in its own right, but the power is normally exercised only as civil contempt with a view to getting the information desired. The statute is punitive and, unlike civil contempt action by a legislative house, permits imprisonment extending beyond the life of a legislative session. The Butler proposal would predetermine for the courts a vital element of the crime.

The proposed language designed to meet the decision in the Cole case is intended to make the power to terminate employment in the National Government in the interest of the national security applicable across the board to nonsensitive, as well as to sensitive, positions. I recognize that there is a considerable body of opinion to support this line of thought, but I think that it is wiser policy to confine the power involved to sensitive positions for two reasons. It does not serve well the security objective to have a blanket scheme which reaches far beyond the real problem area. In our system we should show the greatest possible restraint in applying sanctions to people because of their political ideas and associations. It seems to me that the line between sensitive and nonsensitive positions is a good one for present purposes.

The proposal to meet the decision in the Nelson case is much broader than the subject of sedition; it relates to the subject of Federal supersession generally. So far as the subject of sedition alone is concerned, I contend that there ought to be Federal supersession at least insofar as sedition against the Government of the United States is concerned. I see no indication that the several States are in a satisfactory position to deal with this subject in relation to the protection of the National Government; this is a national problem which overlaps all the States.

The proposal as to the Nelson case, moreover, is simply an interpretive measure. Subsequent Congressional legislation would still have to be interpreted in relation to its own language and the facts in particular cases, and supersession would still be possible. Incidentally, the reference in the proposed language to invalidation of a provision of a State law is not a happy one; supersession is one thing and invalidation is another.

It is not clear, moreover, that the proposed language would serve the purpose, so far as the Nelson case is concerned, since it is interpretive in character and would not clearly cover the interpretation of preexisting legislation not enacted with reference to it.

The proposed language with respect to the Yates case simply ignores a serious constitutional question. The Supreme Court in that case, with a strong basis in previous decisions, pointed out that to hold the Smith Act applicable to the espousal of the idea of overthrow of the Government by force as abstract doctrine would present a serious constitutional question as to freedom of speech. As to the first amendment, it is clear that freedom of thought is absolute. It can be said, moreover, that freedom of speech, not tied to the influencing of action, is certainly very broad. Thus, I think that there is grave doubt that the instant proposal is within constitutional bounds.

What the Jenner bill and the proposed changes deserve is prompt consignment to limbo.

Sincerely,

JEFFERSON B. FORDHAM.

CINCINNATI BAR ASSOCIATION,
Cincinnati, Ohio, April 15, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNING, JR.,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNING: I have your letter of April 10, 1958, and the enclosures on the proposed amendments being considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee when it meets again on April 21, 1958. I was unable to refer this matter to the Judiciary and Legal Reform Committee of the Cincinnati Bar Association, because of the shortness of time. However, I read over the enclosures and I am of the personal opinion that the adoption of the Butler amendments would be unfortunate.

Moreover, I am one of those who feel that even the Jenner amendment should be rejected. I believe that the attempt to take

away the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in matters involving Congressional hearings, is just another adaptation of the attitude to kill the umpire if you don't like the decisions. At the risk of being stodgy, I believe that our current system of checks and balances, as guaranteed by the Constitution, should not be disturbed. I see nothing in the recent decisions of the Supreme Court which requires a limitation on the jurisdiction of that Court. I, too, have found it difficult to agree with some of the recent decisions. However, that, in my judgment, does not serve as a basis for changing the procedure.

I appreciate your sending the material to me, and asking for an opinion. As indicated, this is my personal opinion, and does not reflect the thinking of any committee of the Cincinnati Bar Association.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. DREIDAME.

THE IOWA STATE BAR ASSOCIATION,
Winterset, Iowa, April 16, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNING, JR.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNING: I have read your letter of April 10 with the enclosures. The time is too short to obtain an expression of opinion from the Iowa State Bar Association.

It is my own personal opinion that the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court should not be limited. While I personally sometimes disagree with the opinions of the Supreme Court, I do feel that the independence of the Court should not be limited as proposed by the Jenner bill.

I likewise concur in your opinion as to the Butler amendments. The Butler amendments cover too many subjects, and it would seem that each of the subjects should be introduced as a separate bill to be considered on its own merits.

Yours very truly,

SHIRLEY A. WEBSTER.

MILBANK, TWEED, HOPE & HADLEY,
New York, April 16, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNING, JR.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNING: This is an answer to your letter of April 10 addressed to me as president of the American Law Institute. I must make it clear, however, that I am expressing only my individual views with respect to S. 2646 (called the Jenner bill) and the amendments submitted by Senator JOHN BUTLER.

It happens that I am familiar with the subject because in November 1950 I gave some lectures at Boston University, a copy of which I enclose herewith. Both as a member of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York and of the American Bar Association, I was in favor of the approval of the proposed constitutional amendment which subsequently was introduced by Senator BUTLER, Senate Joint Resolution 44. Both associations approved the proposed amendment.

I am against the Jenner bill and the Butler amendments, jointly and severally. I cannot express my opposition to the Jenner bill as clearly and forcefully as opposition has been expressed by Hon. John Lord O'Brien in his letter to Senator EASTLAND.

Yours very sincerely,

HARRISON TWEED.

P. S.—You may make this public if you wish.

THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 15, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNING, JR.,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNING: I have for acknowledgment your letter of April 10 and

enclosures concerning S. 2646, the so-called Jenner bill, together with Senator BUTLER's proposed amendments. You state that this bill would take from the Supreme Court its appellate jurisdiction in five types of cases and ask for an expression of views.

We have not had time enough to present the matter to the association or to get a committee report (which I expect will be forthcoming promptly). However, discussions have been had with each member of the committee. These include persons in public office, both State and Federal, as well as former Federal attorneys now in private practice. They are uniformly opposed to the bill and its amendments (which they consider merely a restatement or substitute). In addition, I have talked with various of our members and none are in favor of any part or portion. The language of some in opposition was quite strong.

The view was expressed that of the 5 sections, probably 3 were unconstitutional. One would apparently involve the amendment dealing with freedom of speech; another, the separation of functions theory; and a third (section (5) of the bill and 1258 of the amendments) dealing with the "admission of persons to the practice of law" would certainly seem discriminatory.

I have reviewed your very fine brief and have distributed copies to the members of the committee. Since this in part involves joint Federal-State jurisdiction and functions, I have requested additional copies from you for distribution to our interrelations committee with the Philadelphia Bar Association, of which former Congressman, Judge Earl Chudoff, is chairman.

I am avoiding a detailed discussion of the five sections and the proposed amendments at this time, since that is the function of our very representative committee, appointed for the purpose. And to express their views received verbally and without full opportunity for reflection and consideration, would seem premature.

For your immediate purposes, in principle, I have consulted with men learned in our history and our laws, and in their immediate reaction they consider the proposals inconsistent with our basic concepts.

Thanking you for this opportunity to be of service, and with assurances of esteem, I am,

Sincerely yours,

A. S. HARZENSTEIN, President.

MINNESOTA STATE BAR ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., April 14, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNING, Jr.,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 10, addressed to me as president of the Minnesota State Bar Association, relating to Senate 2646, introduced by Senator JENNER, and the amendments proposed by Senator BUTLER.

Since the Senate Judiciary Committee will consider these matters on April 21 next, there is obviously not time for our association or any committee thereof to give consideration to these two bills.

However, as a member of the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association, I was present in Atlanta when the debate took place relative to the wording of the association's condemnation of the Jenner bill. I was in thorough accord with that action and voted to disapprove the Jenner proposal in the language of the ABA resolution. Therefore, without expressing the views of the Minnesota State Bar Association, but merely my personal views, I have no hesitancy in stating that I am opposed both to the Jenner bill and the proposed amendments by Senator BUTLER. I am in thorough accord with many of the comments made by you in your press release regarding limitations on the Supreme Court's jurisdiction. As you so

well point out, the issue here is not whether one agrees or disagrees with any particular decision of the Supreme Court. The issue is whether we should start cutting down the Supreme Court's jurisdiction piecemeal. If we do, the operation will either be found to be futile because unconstitutional, or the functions of the Supreme Court will become so emasculated and limited that it will no longer be the Supreme Court of the land.

I have no objection to having these views made public provided it is made clear that they are my personal views, and not those of the Minnesota State Bar Association.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES G. NYE, President.

ST. LOUIS, MO., April 21, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNING, Jr.,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
The Missouri Bar Board of Governors heartily approves your opposition to S. 2646 and commends you for your position thereon you may make this telegram public if you wish.

HARRY GERSHENSON,
President the Missouri Bar.

NOTRE DAME, IND., March 29, 1958.

Senator THOMAS C. HENNING, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.:

I have had no opportunity to examine the proposed amendment by Senator BUTLER and his memorandum in support thereof. Accordingly, I am not in position to express a considered opinion on the merits of Senator BUTLER's proposal. It is perfectly obvious, however, that it raises questions of great importance and difficulty. With all respect, therefore, I submit most earnestly that no action on this new proposal should be taken by the committee until after hearings have been held and a full opportunity has been extended to all sides to express their views.

JOSEPH O'MEARA,
Dean, Notre Dame Law School.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 28, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNING, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Senator BUTLER's proposed amendments to Jenner bill require most thoroughgoing examination. The AFL-CIO requests opportunity for time for further testimony on proposals constituting grave threats to labor.

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Director, Department of Legislation,
AFL-CIO.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 28, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNING, Jr.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Americans for Democratic Action urge you, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, to hold public hearings on the merits of the Butler proposals offered as amendments to the Jenner bill, S. 2646. These proposals have as their only common theme the reversal of Supreme Court decisions which we regard as legally and morally sound. The Butler amendments would have dangerous, far-reaching, and as yet unfathomed effects on basic rights of American citizens and should be exposed to searching scrutiny by the committee and by the public.

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.,
Vice Chairman, ADA.

WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION,
Seattle, April 16, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNING, Jr.,
United States Senator, United States
Senate Office Building, Washington,
D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNING: Replying to your letter of April 10 and your memorandum in regard to S. 2646, which is now up before the Senate Judiciary Committee for consid-

eration, I have read with interest your thoughts in connection with the proposed bill. As you point out in your letter, there is not time to refer it to the Federal legislative committee of our State Bar Association.

As you point out in your memorandum, the house of delegates in the midyear meeting of the American Bar Association in Atlanta on February 24 and 25, pursuant to the recommendation of the board of governors of the American Bar Association, went on record opposing Senate bill 2646.

Individually, and I wish to stress the point that this matter has not been considered by our State committee, I would agree with the action of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association. The appropriate committee in the American Bar Association gave considerable study to this bill, and certainly their conclusions are entitled to considerable weight.

It seems to me that we should be extremely hesitant in passing any legislation that would limit the jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court for the reason so well stated in your memorandum.

I have no objection to your making my individual views public, if you care to do so.

Yours truly,

FRED C. PALMER.

YAKIMA, WASH., April 21, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNING, Jr.,
United States Senator, United States
Senate Office Building, Washington,
D. C.:

Board of Governors of Washington State Bar Association recommends passage of that part of S. 2646 removing jurisdiction of United States Supreme Court to review admission to State bar cases and State bar disciplinary matters. Our bar association makes no comment on balance of the bill.

FRED C. PALMER,
President, Washington State Bar
Association.

CAMPBELL, CASTELL & THOMAS,
Pittsburgh, Pa., April 18, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNING, Jr.,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNING: Mr. Ira R. Hill, to whom you addressed your letter of April 10, has handed it to me because I am incumbent president of the Allegheny County Bar Association. As you state in your letter, there is not sufficient time for our association or one of its committees to express an opinion on S. 2646 and the amendments thereto, but I am very pleased to have received your memorandum and comments on the bill.

Speaking personally and not on behalf of the Allegheny County Bar Association, I am opposed to S. 2646 and to the Butler amendments thereto.

I agree with the American Bar Association when it says that the bill is contrary to the maintenance of the balance of powers set up in the Constitution. I am particularly impressed with your statement that "As a matter of policy, I do not think we should start limiting the Supreme Court's jurisdiction. If we do, every time the Court hands down a decision which is unpopular with some of the vocal groups, there will be great pressure to cut off the Court's appellate jurisdiction in another field."

You may, if you so desire, make public my views, but only as an individual and not as an officer of the Allegheny County Bar Association. I shall pass along your letter and memorandum to our appropriate committee and I am sure it will be of great interest to them.

Very truly yours,

J. VINCENT BURKE, Jr.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11470) to adjust the method of computing basic pay for officers and enlisted members of the uniformed services, to provide proficiency pay for enlisted members thereof, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KILDAY, Mr. RIVERS, Mr. HEBERT, Mr. HARDY, Mr. GAVIN, Mr. PATTERSON, and Mr. BATES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 71) to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of Maria L. Sanford, late of Minnesota.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ENTITLED "TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1958"

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the House passed House Concurrent Resolution 308, which provides for the printing, for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, of 4,000 additional copies of the hearings entitled "Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958."

As a courtesy which we owe to the House of Representatives, the Senate should act promptly on this concurrent resolution.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The resolution will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 308) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 4,000 additional copies of the hearings entitled "Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EFFECT OF DECLINE IN GOLD CERTIFICATES HELD BY FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the gold stock of the United States Treasury declined by \$611 million between the end of 1957 and April 16, 1958, and has declined further since that date. Some observers have suggested that the foreign demand upon our gold might indicate a growing distrust abroad of the stability of the American dollar.

I asked the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board for his comment on this matter, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Martin's reply be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In your letter of April 21, 1958, you inquire about the decline in gold certificates held by the Federal Reserve System and ask for an explanation of the effects of that decline on the current credit situation.

The gold-certificate holdings of the Federal Reserve System rose in 1957 by \$816 million from \$21,269 million to \$22,085 million, and declined between the end of 1957 and April 16, 1958, by \$496 million to \$21,589 million. These changes reflected approximately corresponding changes in the gold stock of the United States Treasury, which increased by \$832 million in 1957 and declined by \$611 million between the end of 1957 and April 16, 1958.

Apart from transactions in domestically mined gold, the volume of which is negligible, the changes in the United States gold stock invariably reflect gold purchases from, and gold sales to, foreign monetary authorities and the International Monetary Fund. When the rest of the Free World experiences a substantial deficit in its balance of payments with the United States, it tends to replenish its dollar holdings by selling gold to the United States Treasury. If the rest of the Free World has a substantial surplus in its balance of payments with the United States, it tends to convert a large part, and sometimes the total, of its dollar gains into gold by purchasing gold from the United States Treasury.

In 1957 many important countries of the Free World suffered a substantial deficit in their balance of payments, in part because of excess imports due to domestic inflationary pressures and in part because of capital flight due to rumors of an expanding devaluation of the pound sterling. By the end of the year, inflationary pressures had been brought under control in most major foreign countries and the financial community had recognized that the pound sterling was not going to be devalued. For these reasons the balance of payments of the rest of the Free World with the United States improved both on current account (since excess imports of many foreign countries were eliminated by the restoration of financial equilibrium) and on capital account (because the capital that fled foreign countries, and in particular the United Kingdom, started to return). As a result of these changes, the flow of funds between the rest of the Free World and the United States was reversed: the foreign countries that had lost reserves in 1957 started to regain them; and conversely, the United States Treasury, which had purchased gold from foreign countries and the International Monetary Fund in 1957, now sold a large part of this gold back to foreign monetary authorities. The changes in the United States gold stock were thus normal consequences of the changes in the balance of international pay-

ments of the rest of the Free World between 1957 and 1958.

Changes in the United States gold stock affect the gold certificate holdings of the Federal Reserve System, as follows: As the Treasury buys gold, it generally replenishes its dollar balances by issuing gold certificates to the Federal Reserve banks, which credit the Treasury's deposit account with a corresponding amount. When the Treasury sells gold, it generally uses the proceeds to redeem gold certificates held by Federal Reserve banks. The recent decline in certificate holdings was smaller than the decline in the United States Treasury gold stock, however, because the Treasury transferred \$100 million from its free-gold balance to the gold-certificate account.

Gold movements also affect the reserve position of the member banks. A sale of gold to the United States Treasury generally increases the amount of bank deposits and bank reserves, since the seller of gold generally uses the proceeds of the gold sale in a way that transfers them to member banks; conversely, a purchase of gold from the United States Treasury generally reduces bank deposits and bank reserves, since the purchaser generally pays for the gold by drawing on his account with member banks. If the Federal Reserve System wishes to counteract these effects of gold sales and purchases, it has to take measures to reduce bank reserves (e. g., by open-market sales of Treasury bills) in the case of an increase in the United States gold stock; and to expand bank reserves (e. g., by open-market purchases of Treasury bills or by reducing member bank reserve requirements) in the case of a decline in the United States gold stock.

To this extent it is correct to state that the recent expansionary actions of the Federal Reserve System were in part necessary to offset the contracting effect of the decline in the United States gold stock. It would not be correct to state that the decline in the gold stock was in part offsetting the actions of the Federal Reserve System, since the decisions of the Federal Reserve System take account of the changes in the United States gold stock. If there had been no decline in the United States gold stock in 1958, the same degree of ease would have been achieved by somewhat less expansionary actions of the Federal Reserve System.

The problem of maintaining the statutory 25-percent reserve in gold certificates against Federal Reserve notes and deposits does not at present affect the credit situation since Federal Reserve holdings of gold certificates amounted to 46.5 percent of deposits and note liabilities on April 16, 1958, as compared to 46.3 percent on December 31, 1957. There is no danger that gold movements in the foreseeable future would bring the gold-certificate holdings of the Federal Reserve System down to the neighborhood of the statutory minimum.

I hope that this somewhat technical discussion answers your questions. Let me emphasize once more that international movements of gold are necessary in order to maintain the functions of the international gold standard; and that their effect on the reserve position of our banks can easily be offset, as far as necessary, by the policy tools available to the Federal Reserve System.

Sincerely yours,

WM. MCC. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It may be noticed that Chairman Martin says the loss of our gold reserves so far in 1958 was more than balanced by an increase of \$832 million in 1957 and he attributes both movements to normal efforts of other nations to balance their dollar payments to the United States. Last

year foreign inflation and rumors that the pound might be devalued sent gold to this country. This year more stabilized financial conditions abroad have reversed that trend.

Mr. Martin also indicates confidence that the Federal Reserve Board can offset changes in our gold supply by policy tools which it has available and still make adjustments needed to stabilize our bank credit supply, and he says there is no danger that gold movements in the foreseeable future will bring gold certificate holdings of the Federal Reserve System down to the statutory minimum.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I believe we should not overlook the fact that the current movement of gold is out of the United States; that the privilege of exchanging American dollars for gold, which is denied to American citizens, does reduce our bank reserves and the credit based on them, that if inflation abroad last year caused gold to be sent to this country, inflation here could cause it to be sent out again; and if carried to the extent which foreign holdings of American dollar exchange would make possible, this movement could have a serious impact on our economy.

A recent tabulation of pending spending plans, including one made by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, indicates a possibility of a deficit at the end of the next fiscal year of \$10 billion without a tax cut and a deficit of from \$15 to \$18 billion with a tax cut. A deficit of that magnitude is bound to be inflationary and at the same time be disturbing to foreign nations which acquire large sums of American dollars through our purchases abroad, the spending of American tourists, and donations made under our foreign-aid program.

With consumer buying running at the rate of \$280 billion a year, each 1-percent price increase represents an invisible tax upon the American consumer of more than \$2 billion.

It is highly important, therefore, for us to plan a recovery from the current recession in a manner that will prevent uncontrolled price inflation at home and which will prevent loss abroad of confidence in the American dollar which, in turn, would further complicate our economic problems.

THE FOREIGN-TRADE PROGRAM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the United States, by taking the lead in the creation of the United Nations, has demonstrated the dedication of our people to the concept of peaceful settlement of international disputes. By the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine for Greece and Turkey, and NATO, we made known to friend and foe alike America's determination to preserve peace through cooperation and strength—economic and military.

The reciprocal-trade program is important both to the development of our economy here at home and to the strength and stability of free nations everywhere. It was conceived by my great fellow Tennessean, Cordell Hull,

and initially implemented under the leadership of former President Franklin D. Roosevelt. This program has passed the test of time, serving our country well under the administration of 2 Democratic presidents and 1 Republican president. It has contributed to our own economic development and has promoted mutually advantageous trade among the nations of the Free World, thus contributing to collective strength and security.

Today this program stands in danger. It will expire altogether unless action is taken within 60 days to extend it. The issue is clear. The issue is whether our representative form of government can once again demonstrate that the overall national interest will prevail over the desires of local and sectional interests.

A great deal of misinformation has been disseminated about this program. Some would have us believe that it is a sort of giveaway deal under which we eliminate all of our tariffs unilaterally, for the benefit of other countries—a sort of sly method of transferring the jobs of American men and women to foreign countries. Nothing could be further from the truth. The real purpose of the program is to increase mutually advantageous trade among the nations of the world by reducing artificial trade barriers. Insofar as we ourselves are concerned, it has meant the promotion of increased trade, exports as well as imports.

We have come to depend on imports for such vital materials as asbestos, chromite, industrial diamonds, manganese, nickel, and tungsten. Altogether, we import about one-tenth of our raw material requirements. Such vast imports certainly create many jobs. Indeed, without some of them, our whole industrial structure would have to be changed. Imports certainly figure prominently and constructively in the overall balance of the economy. Imports, like exports, create many jobs.

More trade means more money in the pockets of American businessmen, farmers, and workers. Increased exports are translated into increased jobs. Last year we sold \$19.5 billion worth of goods abroad. We have been exporting recently about 9 percent of our production of movable goods, 8 percent of our manufactured goods, 26 percent of construction and mining equipment, 19 percent of our trucks, 11 percent of our machine tools, 14 percent of our coal production, and from 20 to 40 percent of our cotton, rice, and tobacco. We cannot expect to maintain that level, much less increase it, unless we are willing to accept some of the articles our friends abroad have for sale. To me, the evidence is overwhelming that more trade will help our economy.

There is a tendency on the part of some to disregard the substantial volume of our export trade and to seek to focus attention on the approximately \$13 billion in imports which were brought into this country last year. Of this volume of imports, however, only about \$3 billion worth could reasonably be said to be competitive with domes-

tic production. The remainder consists of raw materials vital to our industries and other items not grown or produced competitively in the United States.

Thus, to the extent that imports create a problem, the problem is confined to imports of about \$3 billion in value. It just does not make sense to jeopardize \$19.5 billion of export trade in order to reduce or prevent \$3 billion in imports. That is exactly what would happen if we fail to continue our reciprocal trade program. A revision to the catastrophic protectionist philosophy of the Smoot-Hawley Act would inevitably encourage other countries to erect trade barriers against American products, with consequent decrease in our export trade, bringing about serious repercussions in our own economy as well as in the economy of other nations.

With more than 5 million people unsuccessfully seeking jobs and with a continuing decline in the indexes of economic activity, we can ill afford a decline in export trade.

The world economic challenge we face has not been dramatized by the launching of a sputnik, but it is nevertheless real, and potentially just as dangerous to our security as is the military threat. The leaders of the Kremlin think nothing of depriving the Soviet people of the fruits of their own productivity to seize any opportunity to open the trade routes to other nations.

Let us not delude ourselves. Many nations of the world must trade to live. If they do not trade with us, they will trade elsewhere. The Soviet Union is determinedly undertaking to seize markets heretofore enjoyed by the United States and our friends. We cannot meet this challenge by erecting trade barriers and by encouraging others to erect trade barriers against us. This is the formula for defeat, not victory.

This vital program cannot be judged in finality on the basis of a narrow interpretation of local or regional interests. The national interest must be the real yardstick. And when viewed broadly and realistically, that which is good for the United States is also good for each State and citizen.

Mr. President, I recognize the political difficulty of this issue—for individual Members of Congress, and particularly for the Democratic Party, since the overwhelming majority of the members of the President's own party stand in solid opposition, ready to take political advantage of a Democratic effort to maximize the national interest. Even so, the Democratic Party must accept responsibility for, and undertake the task of, securing legislative approval of this program, preferably with bipartisan support, but alone if need be. We must not fail in this effort.

TIMBER RESOURCES

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the eight Senators who represent Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington have sent to Secretary of Agriculture Benson a joint letter on our timber resources which I ask unanimous consent be

printed in the RECORD, at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter may be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, we have all been most favorably impressed by this 700-page study which has been under way since early 1952. A tremendous amount of conscientious effort on the part of many people brought forth this comprehensive review. But it is just a starting point. It gives us facts and information we never before possessed. It provides a basis for action and for programs. It will enable us to assess the Federal, State, and local responsibilities and to define the efforts each level of government and private initiative must undertake.

This document sets forth no plan or policy. It suggests no course of action or cure. Instead it paints the picture as it now exists and unveils for us what the future may hold. We have the destiny of our children and of this Nation in our hands. What we do, and more important, what we fail to do, to protect and develop our natural resources will set the pattern for the future. Dickens in his Christmas Carol took Morley back to the past and into the future. This timber review contains the same moral and it contains a message we cannot wisely fail to heed.

As Chief Forester McArdle so aptly said in the preface:

What we do in the next 10 or 20 years will determine whether we shall grow enough timber to enable our children and their children to enjoy the timber abundance that we ourselves know.

The Federal programs that affect our national forests and our public-domain timberlands are a part of this structure. We are not developing these lands rapidly enough. We need roads and services to equip these forests to produce their full allowable cut.

Our small private holdings suffer from overcutting and lack of management. This is a most perplexing problem which cries for serious consideration. I want now to reiterate the 21 highlights of this report so that its significance will be clear.

First. Continued expansion of the Nation's economy is expected.

Second. Potential demand for timber products is strikingly upward.

Third. The United States must continue to rely chiefly on domestic timber resources.

Fourth. The Nation has no surplus of commercial forest land.

Fifth. One-fourth of the forest land is poorly stocked or nonstocked.

Sixth. Three-fourths of the forest land is in the East, but two-thirds of the saw-timber volume is in the West.

Seventh. Total timber volumes are about the same as in 1945.

Eighth. Heavy reliance is placed on a small group of species.

Ninth. Timber quality is declining.

Tenth. Timber growth is increasing.

Eleventh. Most eastern species now have favorable growth-cut ratios.

Twelfth. One-fourth of the timber cut is not utilized.

Thirteenth. Destructive agents, principally insects and disease, take extraordinary toll.

Fourteenth. Fifty-two million acres need planting.

Fifteenth. Forest productivity is poorest on small farms and other private ownerships, especially in the South.

Sixteenth. Forest productivity is best in public and forest industry ownerships.

Seventeenth. Inadequate stocking is the most significant factor in reducing productivity of recently cut-over land.

Eighteenth. Improved stocking, control of destructive agents, accelerated planting, and better utilization are the four best possibilities of increasing timber supplies.

Nineteenth. The key to adequate timber supplies in the future lies with the 4.5 million farm and other private holdings.

Twentieth. Growth needed to sustain future timber demands is much greater than 1952 growth.

Twenty-first. Projected growth is far short of needs.

It is our hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will take advantage of the legislative authority he now possesses to come forth with a national program of forestry. It would be my personal view that the Federal Government must supply the one great aid that it can so ably provide—leadership—in order that we may enjoy the maximum effectiveness from our combined efforts.

EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,

April 24, 1958.

HON. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On March 28 the Chief of the Forest Service transmitted a copy of the Timber Resource for America's Future to Members of Congress. It is a most comprehensive study of our forestry situation. It is our hope that you are equally pleased and that you will use the means Congress has authorized for you to publicly commend and perhaps award those associated with the production of this timber resource review.

We are dedicating this year to the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt. It is most appropriate that we undertake to make this dedication even more meaningful by breathing new life into the great programs that President Theodore Roosevelt started, with the able assistance of his Secretary of Agriculture, James Wilson, and his Chief Forester, Gifford Pinchot.

The McNary-McSweeney Act authorizes and directs the gathering of facts necessary to determine ways and means to balance the timber budget of the United States, and this language is broad enough to embrace the presentation of recommendations to the Congress.

We would like to suggest that serious consideration be given to a departmental report to the Congress on legislation now enacted at the Federal and State levels, as well as additional legislation and authorizations which the Congress and several States could consider and would insure a national forestry program now to assure our wood needs by the year 2000.

We would also appreciate your making this letter available to Chief Forester McArdle, along with our warm congratulations to him and those who labored with him in the assembling of this great timber resource review.

We desire your views on the action you will propose to take this year. We look forward to hearing from you soon and to working with you in every possible way.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK CHURCH, HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
HENRY M. JACKSON, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, MIKE MANSFIELD, WAYNE MORSE,
JAMES E. MURRAY, RICHARD L. NEUBERGER.

THE RUSSIAN VIEWPOINT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently three Americans visited the Soviet Union to observe the elections to the Supreme Soviet—the Soviet legislative body. A group of three Soviet citizens had visited America during the presidential election year of 1956 to observe a national political campaign and to study the election process. One of the Americans who visited Russia is a very good friend of mine, and a highly respected scholar in the field of political science. He has had several years of service to our Government in important capacities in the Department of State. He is considered one of America's foremost students on the subject of elections. I refer to Mr. Richard M. Scammon, director of elections research, Governmental Affairs Institute, 1726 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. Scammon has written several interesting and informative articles concerning his recent trip to the Soviet Union. One of them, entitled "Why the Russians Bother With Elections," appeared in the magazine section of the New York Times. Another, entitled "It's Hard To Argue With a Soviet Citizen," appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Sunday, April 20, 1958. Both of these articles deserve the careful attention of Members of Congress and all persons interested in a better understanding of the Soviet Union.

I ask unanimous consent that the two articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 20, 1958]

IT'S HARD TO ARGUE WITH A SOVIET CITIZEN

(Three Americans went to Russia last month to watch the elections to the Supreme Soviet. They were invited by the State Department to return the visit of three Russians who came here in 1956 to observe our presidential campaign. The Americans visited Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Tbilisi, Stalingrad and Tashkent. They asked many questions, answered some and argued still others. The Washington Post has asked one of these observers to write his impressions of these verbal exchanges. The author is director of elections research for the Governmental Affairs Institute here and is editor of the institute's elections handbook, America Votes.)

(By Richard M. Scammon)

It is hard to argue with a Soviet citizen. It is hard, not because he is not ready to argue for communism—far from it. It is hard because words mean such different

things under democracy and under communism. And it is hard because the Russian has so little information about the world beyond the Iron Curtain.

These were the major difficulties encountered by the American elections team in its March tour of the U. S. S. R. Yet this 18-day journey from Leningrad into central Asia was packed with questions, discussions and arguments.

Some of these exchanges were conversations aboard the plane which carried the Americans and their seven Russian escorts around the Soviet Union. On the longer trips—from Stalingrad to Tashkent, for example—the conversations went on for hours. Other exchanges developed from questions put to the Americans in the many conferences with Soviet governmental, economic and party officials. Still others came from casual meetings with the Soviet "man in the street."

Some of the discussions were quiet talks about technical questions; others were noisy free-for-alls over broad policy. Some were earnest Russian efforts to get information about our country; others seemed to us to be "curve ball" efforts to point up a hoped-for Soviet advantage.

TWO BIG BARRIERS

But almost always the conversations were marked by these same two difficulties: Words just didn't mean the same thing in the two languages, and the Russians seemed not to have our advantage of knowing at least something about the other man's viewpoint. The American defense of the individual's right not to go to the polls if he didn't want to, got into real trouble when the excellent Russian interpreter frankly admitted that he didn't understand what the Americans were talking about and found it hard to translate what he couldn't understand.

To the Soviets, this right not to be active was simply not comprehensive. If it was good for people to vote—which all the Americans agreed was true, providing there was a contest and therefore something to vote for—then it was obvious that the state ought to see to it that people voted. In a society in which so many things are pure white or pitch black, the doctrine of a tolerant grayness found little understanding.

So it was, too, with the one question which seemed to come up endlessly in Russia. At nearly every conference someone would ask, "Why does your American Congress have so few workers?" Usually, the questioner would add a statistic about the number of workers from his area sitting in the Supreme Soviet—one-fourth or one-third of the delegation, or whatever the proportion might be.

WHAT IS A WORKER?

For the Americans the answer was simple: No workers sit in Congress because Congress is a 16-hour-a-day job all by itself. A man can't paint houses 8 hours a day and be a Member of Congress in his spare time.

A Member of Congress spends more than half the year in Washington making laws and attends to the wants of his constituents the year round. A worker has to quit his regular job if he goes to Congress—quit it to take on the bigger job of representing his district in setting national policy and looking after his people with the Federal Government.

The Russians had considered Congress a counterpart of their Supreme Soviet, but the Congress described by us was nothing like their parliamentary body.

The Supreme Soviet meets only twice a year and then for only a week or so each time. A farmer, a carpenter, or a streetcar conductor can be a delegate by taking a brief leave of absence from his work. In fact, he is expected to stay on the job after being elected. One building plasterer whom

the Americans met in Stalingrad is probably back at work right now, having taken a few days off to attend the March meeting of the Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

POWER RESTS ELSEWHERE

Of course, these brief semiannual meetings allow no time for any real consideration of policy or for hearings on legislation—in short, no time to make laws. But in the Soviet Union this isn't necessary, because the real seat of Soviet power is the Communist Party and, more particularly, the presidium or executive board of the party's central committee. This presidium used to be known as the Politburo.

When it was decided to decentralize industry, and again to transfer farm machinery ownership from the machine tractor stations to individual collective farms, the decisions were made within the party. Very possibly these decisions were made after much debate—enough debate to get several members of the presidium thrown out of office. But no such debate was heard in the Supreme Soviet. The real decisions of Soviet politics are made in the presidium.

Again and again the Americans asked their hosts, how many house painters or plasterers actually leave their 8-hour-a-day jobs to sit in on sessions of the presidium or of the party's central committee. We never got an answer, and I suppose it was because there may not be any such workers on these bodies.

There aren't any in Congress, either, for the same reason. Making the policy of a nation is a full-time business, whether it be in Washington or Moscow.

So the different meanings of words in the United States and the Soviet Union is one obstacle to useful discussion with the Russians. The other is that most Russians have only such knowledge of the outside world as has been fed to them by their own propaganda agencies. It is difficult to argue politics with them because they have no effective idea of what their opponents believe.

In the United States, a Khrushchev speech or a Kremlin policy statement is available to any newspaper reader in English. In Russia, the statements of Free World governments are available in libraries in the original language to those who can translate them. The Soviet press publishes little of such information and the Western press is banned from Russia except for such Communist-line papers as the London Daily Worker and the Paris L'Humanite.

The same is true of books and magazines. Nothing favorable to democracy or capitalism is available in Russia in the Russian language. Nikita Khrushchev told the American election observers that the Soviet press would soon publish the comments of AFL-CIO President George Meany on the American recession, but he indicated that it would be done to "show the evils of capitalism" to Russia's younger generation.

Many Russians, however, do not want to argue politics with Americans; they simply want information about life in the United States. The Russian man in the street has been told so often that his country will overtake and surpass capitalist America that he is intensely curious about this fairyland whose riches are the envy of the Soviet economy.

His questions are not about the difference between Congress and the Supreme Soviet, but, "How much does an American worker earn?"; "Could I own a car?"; "How much did that suit cost?"

Exchange visits of Americans to the U. S. S. R., and large-scale exchanges of films, radio, and television programs, newspapers, books and magazines would answer some of these questions for the Russians. They need answering, for the answers would contribute to understanding, and true peace can be achieved only on a basis of mutual understanding.

[From the New York Times of April 6, 1958]
WHY THE RUSSIANS BOTHER WITH ELECTIONS
(By Richard M. Scammon)

Recently some 134 million Soviet citizens trooped to voting precincts all over the U. S. S. R. to participate in the quadrennial choice of their national congress. This congress is a two-chamber body called the Supreme Soviet, made up of a Soviet of the Union and a Soviet of Nationalities. Theoretically it is the fountainhead of all authority in the Soviet state, the highest organ of state power in the U. S. S. R.

To the houses of this Supreme Soviet were elected 1,378 candidates; 738 sit in the Soviet of the Union on the basis of 1 per 300,000 of population and 640 more form the Soviet of Nationalities, allocated on fixed quotas to subdivisions of the U. S. S. R.—25 per republic, 11 per autonomous republic, and so on. It would be hard to find 1,378 candidates who had an easier job of winning an election. Not a single one of these men and women was opposed; the 1,378 districts had exactly 1,378 candidates.

Of the 134 million voters in the Soviet Union, 99.97 percent turned out to vote and all but a half-million dutifully dropped their ballots in the box for the official candidates. Certainly the Soviet candidate, once his name gets on the ballot, can count himself the world's least worried seeker after public office.

Who are these unworried candidates? And how are they selected? And why? It was to seek answers to these questions that a three-man American elections team visited the Soviet Union last month. This team, invited by the Soviet authorities as an exchange for a Soviet group which observed the American presidential elections in 1956, toured the U. S. S. R. for 2 weeks just prior to the March 16 voting. These are some of the views the author, as a member of the American delegation, developed during this recent visit.

The first question to emerge in the minds of most Western observers as they watch the unfolding of a Soviet election is "Why?" There is no contest in any of these votes. Only the single name of the single official candidate appears on the ballot. Nominations of these candidates are arranged by the Communist Party in its character as the only recognized political unit in the Soviet Union and in its work as guide to the Soviet people in the building of socialism. Though candidates are formally presented by so-called public organizations, actually, as in any one-party state, nominations are organized by the Communist Party apparatus.

Moreover, once these unopposed candidates are elected they have very little to do. For the great majority, their semiannual week in Moscow is the major expression of their public activity. It is not in the brief sessions of the Supreme Soviet that basic decisions of policy are made, not in the uniformly unanimous votes of these bodies that a true location of power may be identified. Rather must the observer look to the machinery of the Communist Party, the party's central committee, and especially to the presidium of that central committee for the real policymakers.

It has been within these party institutions that Soviet authority has been exercised. If new policies are to emerge in the organization of industry, if new freedoms are to be granted factory directors in the management of their enterprises, it is within these party institutions that discussion will be held, and decisions made. When it was decided to abolish the long-established machine tractor stations and permit individual collective farms to buy and keep their own farm machinery, this decision was reached within the party, not by debate in the Supreme Soviet.

Nor can these votes be regarded in any way as a guide to the party leadership as to how the Soviet people feel about them or their program. Nomination of candidates is done by unanimous open voting in open meetings. On election day the voter is permitted to make use of a secret polling booth if he wishes, but he is not required to do so. The ballot needs no "X," it can be put in the box as printed, without further effort. Since the elector is not required to use a booth or do anything but drop his prepared ballot in the box, that is what he usually does. To enter the booth is to indicate to one and all an intention to cross out the official party-endorsed candidate. In a state-organized referendum on the state's own policy, such an act obviously is the work of an oppositionist, and this in an election day atmosphere in which even failure to appear at the polls may be regarded as an evidence of antistate activity.

But the party obviously feels there is value in these elections or it would not expend time and effort in organizing them—and the expenditure of both these resources is enormous. Partly the purpose behind this investment of resources may be the need felt by every regime (even a one-party regime) for popular endorsement and consent to its program, no matter how unreal the conditions under which that endorsement be produced.

Partly the purpose may be to have on hand a representative state body (the Supreme Soviet) to appear to maintain some of the realities of Western democracy. Though the comparison has no validity whatever, many Soviet citizens are undoubtedly convinced that their Supreme Soviet is something like the American Congress. Moreover, the very existence of a parliament serves to divert a measure of public attention from the true location of Soviet power in the hands and institutions of the Communist Party.

Then, too, the elections are a great decoration day ceremony for honoring those who have excelled in building socialism—not just party leaders, but people in every stratum of Soviet life and work. The honor of Supreme Soviet membership is widely distributed and there is no question but that members of the Supreme Soviet wear their honor proudly.

The 1,378 unopposed members of the Supreme Soviet seem to be all sorts of persons, to come from all walks of life. Some are bench workers, some collective farmers, some teachers, some party officials. There is probably no major activity in the U. S. S. R. that does not count a Supreme Soviet delegate among its numbers. Many are younger people, many are women. This is possible since candidates for the Supreme Soviet are not picked to govern, but are picked because of their contribution to the building of socialism.

A recordbreaking dairymaid, a master plasterer, a scientific researcher, an explorer, a high party functionary—these would be ideal candidate types. Members of the Supreme Soviet do not put in the long, hard months of work typical of an American Congressman. They are not bothered with tough policymaking decisions on farm legislation, taxes, or foreign policy, although a few are more active than the majority by virtue of committee assignments.

In theory candidates may be nominated by any public organization—a trade union, a youth group, a cooperative, a meeting of factory workers. In practice, units of the Communist Party operate in all organizations having the right to nominate candidates, and these units are probably the first point of candidate selection.

One must say "probably" because details of party work in proposing and selecting candidates are obscure. One cannot say how

much instruction may come from above in these matters, or how much the views of local organizations are followed in picking those whose names are to go on the unopposed ballot.

What can be said is that the Soviet Union is a one-party state and that the Communist Party operates effectively and finally at every level of the election process. Party Secretary Nikita Khrushchev remarked to the American observers of the March 16 voting that the American team was "quite right in noticing the party organization plays a major role in selecting candidates" and that in the final analysis nominations were made by "reliable persons."

This does not mean that the party takes every job for itself. On the contrary, the organization is anxious to have nonparty people among the list of nominees. Much is made of the "bloc of Communist and non-party people," the official label under which the 1,378 official candidates seek votes. Although a substantial minority are not party members, all are supposedly loyal and zealous supporters of the regime—they could not have qualified for this honor if they were not, nor would the party send them to the Supreme Soviet had it any doubts about them.

Frequently more than one name will be put up by the public organizations of the area to be represented—but the extra names are those of national leaders like Khrushchev, Voroshilov, or Mikoyan. If several names are proposed, an unofficial preselection meeting of representatives of public organizations within the district will be held. At these preselection meetings, voting is by show of hands, and there is no evidence of any meeting ever having a contested or split vote. All decisions seem to be made unanimously, whether these decisions are to put forward a single local candidate, or to present a national figure, or to combine the two and suggest several candidates.

National leaders in the U. S. S. R. can be on the ballot in only one district, but meetings may suggest their names in any number of constituencies. Such extra nominations are a special type of honorary mention in Soviet politics, and all save one are later declined by the leaders concerned.

Thus, but one genuine candidate comes before the voters on election day. As one observer put it 20 years ago, in commenting on the way in which but a single candidate was finally registered in each district, "Some machinery must have been in operation which is not revealed by the public record." That machinery was—and is—the party.

Once the candidate has been formally registered for the district, the campaign machinery can get up full steam. Basic to getting out the vote in the unopposed Soviet election is the agitpunkt—literally an agitation point. There will be about as many of these agitpunkts as there are voting precincts, some 150,000 in the March 16 elections. The agitpunkt may be a room or two in a factory, perhaps the foyer of a large office building—any place to which attention of the voters may be directed and from which the roundup of voters may be directed. Prominently identified by large red signs and furnished with election literature, the agitpunkt will be manned by volunteer agitators for weeks before the actual voting.

Election materials featured in most agitpunkt locations will include pictures and biographies of the official candidates, posters urging people to vote, magazine and newspaper tables, and usually a copy of the list of voters in the precinct concerned. While not universally the case, many of the agitpunkt operations are dismantled on election eve and reappear on election day at precinct polling places.

From the agitpunkt a huge army of agitators moves out during the campaign to insure

that all citizens of 18 and over have been listed by the local authorities and that all are aware of their duty on election day. Indeed it would be hard for the Soviet citizen to be unaware of the voting process. Press and radio, banners and decorations, agitpunkt centers and agitators, big rallies and small local meetings—all combine to press home the date of the vote and the opportunity of the citizen to endorse the work of the party and the regime.

As to the campaign itself, there is no contest, of course. For the March 16 election there were no competing banners, no contesting canvassers, no seeking after votes between rival candidates. The public decorations, the campaign rallies, the meetings organized by agitators and by candidates—all were pitched to constant themes: the unity of party and state, the great accomplishments of the U. S. S. R. domestically, "peace" in foreign affairs, the glowing future of the Soviet Union, and the like. From time to time, as with Party Secretary Khrushchev's speech in Moscow 2 days before the actual voting, these themes were interlarded with attacks on the West, criticisms of Western election methods; and comment on the hard life of the Western worker.

On election day the polls opened at 6 in the morning, and polling operations seemed to go smoothly everywhere and to be well (if massively) organized. For a typical Moscow precinct of some 2,000 voters as many as 20 or 25 clerks would be on hand to check voter names and hand out ballots.

Lines were not long, for the voting procedures was hardly onerous. Although curtained voting booths were provided for any who might care to use them, on-the-spot observation indicated that less than one elector in fifty did so. For the vast majority of voters the prepared ballots passed directly from election clerk to ballot box.

For those too ill or infirm to come to the polls, an official came around with a miniature ballot box into which the votes of electors confined at home might be placed. For those absent from home, special certificates were issued to enable them to vote anywhere in the Soviet Union. With all the exhortations of the weeks prior to election day it is not surprising that most precincts had virtually every vote cast by mid-afternoon. For any laggards the party organization provided stimulus—agitators going around to residences to point out their duty to those few who had failed to appear at the polling place.

At midnight the polls closed. Ballot boxes were unsealed and the counters carefully noted the few ballots in which the voter had bothered to cross out the name of the single official candidate—the only way in which he might indicate opposition. With the figures all over the Soviet Union totaled up, it could then be announced that 99.97 percent of the voters had appeared at the polls and that all save a few hundred thousand had indicated their support of the "bloc of Communist and nonparty people."

Perhaps the real answer to our first question—"Why?"—comes actually in the very unanimity and massiveness of the vote cast. Soviet elections are but one in the long series of "methods of activism" pursued in Soviet society—methods designed to weave the citizen and his life inextricably into a world of active struggle against capitalism. For party members or for ordinary citizens "passivism" is wrong; it is the error of resting a moment from assigned tasks, of momentarily standing passive and mute, aside from the struggle. Activity is a key word in Soviet life, and elections present maximum activity. Everyone participates—this one as an agitator, that one as an election clerk, everyone as a voter. In the Soviet mind, every participant is thus an activist and every participant commits himself just a bit more to the Communist way of life.

CONTROL OF ADVERTISING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently I have received in my office many petitions and letters from organizations and individuals in Minnesota expressing their interest in the Langer bill, S. 582, which prohibits interstate transmission, by mail or otherwise, of newspapers, periodicals, newsreels, photographic films, or records advertising alcoholic beverages or soliciting orders therefor, also prohibiting liquor advertising by radio.

Since hearings on this measure are today being resumed by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I ask unanimous consent to read into the record the names of individuals and organizations who have written urging support of S. 582.

Mr. William R. Peterson, chairman, and Mr. Fred D. Shandorf, secretary of the Minnesota Methodist Board of Temperance, Rosemount, Minn.; Mrs. E. H. Nickum, Rochester, Minn., who sent in a petition with 117 signatures; Mrs. Emma Bjornstad, Duluth, Minn., who sent in a petition with 145 signatures; Mrs. Sophie Rasmussen, Milaca, Minn., who sent in a petition with 18 signatures. A petition circulated by the Reverend Harold E. Lind, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Red Wing, Minn., consisting of 42 signatures. Mrs. Ardell E. Nelson, social action secretary of the Women's Missionary Federation, the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Kirkhoven, has written in behalf of the membership of that organization. Petitions have also been received from Rev. V. A. Jensen, pastor, Glendora Lutheran Church, Princeton, Minn.; Mrs. Frances N. Wiest, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. Lester Skoberg, president, First English Lutheran Ladies Aid, Sacred Heart, Minn.; Mrs. Dana Portner, Northfield, Minn.; Mr. D. W. Fuller, Danube, Minn.; the Reverend Herbert D. McDonald, pastor, First Baptist Church, Milaca, Minn.; Mrs. Paul Everts, Foley, Minn.; Rev. Lawrence Palmquist, Oak Park, Minn.; and Mrs. Clarence Fondell, Dawson, Minn.

I should also like to make special mention here of the very deep interest in S. 582 expressed by my very good friend, Mr. Wilbur Korfhage, administrative director of the United Temperance Union, Minneapolis, Minn.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10746) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments, under the heading

"Title I—Department of the Interior—Departmental Offices—Office of Saline Water—Salaries and Expenses," on page 2, line 8, after the word "uses", to strike out "\$785,000" and insert "\$825,000."

Under the subhead "Office of Oil and Gas—Salaries and Expenses," on page 2, line 17, after "(15 U. S. C. 715)", to strike out "\$500,000", and insert "\$550,000."

Under the subhead "Office of the Solicitor—Salaries and Expenses," on page 2, at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "\$2,750,000" and insert "\$2,825,000."

On page 3, after line 9, to insert:

ACQUISITION OF STRATEGIC MINERALS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the "Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columblum-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956" (70 Stat. 579), exclusive of section 2a, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$2,318,000, to remain available until December 31, 1958; and the unobligated balance of the funds made available under this heading in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1958 (Public Law 85-77), shall remain available until said date.

Under the subhead "Bureau of Land Management—Management of Lands and Resources," on page 4, line 4, after the word "on", to insert "or adjacent to"; and in line 6, after the word "lands", to strike out "\$20,940,000" and insert "\$22,940,000."

Under the subhead "Construction," on page 4, line 15, after the word "on", to insert "or adjacent to"; at the beginning of line 17, to strike out the word "on"; in the same line, after the word "of", to insert "rights-of-way and of", and on page 5, line 3, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$4,435,000" and insert "\$4,685,000."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Indian Affairs—Education and Welfare Services," on page 7, line 14, after the word "museums", to strike out "\$57,469,000" and insert "\$58,809,000."

Under the subhead "Resources Management," on page 7, line 24, after the word "law", to strike out "\$17,000,000" and insert "\$18,100,000."

Under the subhead "Construction," on page 8, line 15, after the word "contract", strike out "\$13,800,000" and insert "\$40,526,000", and in line 16, after the word "expended", to insert "of which not to exceed \$12,000 may be paid to the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission for the construction of culverts at Zeibaugh Pass, N. Dak."

Under the subhead "Geological Survey—Surveys, Investigations, and Research," on page 12, line 15, after the word "activities", to strike out "\$36,000,000" and insert "\$36,915,000", and in line 16, after the word "which", to strike out "\$6,035,000" and insert "\$6,950,000."

Under the subhead "Administrative Provisions," on page 13, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "ninety-two passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only" and insert "one hundred and twelve passenger motor vehicles, of which ninety-two are for replacement only."

On page 14, after line 7, to insert:

CONSTRUCTION

For the construction and improvement of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau

of Mines, to remain available until expended, \$1,719,000.

Under the subhead "National Park Service—Management and Protection," on page 16, line 3, after the word "Basin", to strike out "\$14,150,000" and insert "\$14,632,000."

Under the subhead "Maintenance and Rehabilitation of Physical Facilities," on page 16, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "\$11,600,000" and insert "\$12,750,000."

Under the subhead "Construction," on page 16, line 22, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$12,400,000" and insert "\$24,000,000, of which not to exceed \$135,000 shall be available for the construction of additional school facilities at Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz."

Under the subhead "Fish and Wildlife Service—Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife—Management and Investigations of Resources," on page 18, line 24, after the word "deer", to strike out "\$11,508,000" and insert "\$11,616,000."

Under the subhead "Construction," on page 19, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "\$1,458,000" and insert "\$3,879,350."

Under the subhead "Alaska Public Works," on page 25, line 4, after "(48 U. S. C. 486-486j)", to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$5,300,000."

Under the heading "Title II—Related Agencies—Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Forest Protection and Utilization," on page 29, at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "\$68,857,000" and insert "\$81,357,000."

On page 30, line 3, after the word "law", to strike out "\$12,128,000" and insert "\$16,728,000."

On page 30, line 11, to strike out "\$12,195,000" and insert "\$13,245,000."

On page 30, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$150,000."

Under the subhead "Forest Roads and Trails," on page 30, at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "\$23,750,000" and insert "\$27,000,000", and on page 31, line 1, after the word "expended", to insert "and this amount may be used to the extent necessary for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in section 106 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (23 U. S. C. 155) and section 6 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-381)."

On page 31, after line 11, to insert:

ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

For expenses necessary to carry out section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 188), \$500,000, to remain available until expended.

On page 31, after line 21, to insert:

SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST

For the acquisition of forest land within the Superior National Forest, Minn., under the provisions of the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 570; 16 U. S. C. 577c-577h), as amended, \$300,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned.

Under the subhead "General Provisions, Forest Service," on page 33, line 12, after the word "improvements", to

strike out the comma and "but the cost of any such building, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and of connecting the same with any such building, and exclusive of any tower upon which a lookout house may be erected, shall not exceed \$25,000 (\$30,000 in Alaska), except for one building which shall not exceed \$80,000: *Provided*, That one building may be constructed to serve the purposes of two or more buildings at a cost not to exceed the sum of the limitations for separate buildings", and in line 21, after the word "*Provided*", to strike out "*further*".

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill, as thus amended, be regarded, for purposes of amendment, as original text; provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amount of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives was \$413,145,600.

The net amount by which the bill was increased by the Senate committee was \$75,794,350.

The total of the bill as reported to the Senate is \$488,939,950.

The amount of the budget estimates considered was \$414,484,600.

The amount of 1958 appropriations, including the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1958, and the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1958, is \$459,865,100.

The bill as reported to the Senate is \$74,455,350 over the budget estimates, and \$29,074,850 over the appropriations for the fiscal year 1958.

I invite attention to the following statement on page 2 of the committee report:

The committee recognizes that the recommendations represent a substantial increase over the budget estimates. However, it is the view of the committee that the funds recommended are fully justified and required to:

1. Provide adequate education facilities for Indian children;
2. Continue the 10-year program for the development of the national parks;
3. Strengthen management, protection, and development practices on our public lands and national forests;
4. Provide for an adequate research program for the conservation and development of natural resources; and
5. Provide for the construction of a limited number of long-deferred facilities that are urgently needed for various management and research programs.

In addition to being a sound program from the standpoint of wise conservation and development practices, it must be recognized that an expansion of these programs will provide many job opportunities throughout the country immediately, as no time-consuming plans and preparations are required.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize as strongly as I can that the increases recommended by the committee will provide jobs immediately. The programs provided for are not new but an expansion

of going programs. To a large extent these increases recommended by the committee will merely offset a curtailment of these programs recommended in the budget.

These programs will be administered by permanent agencies in the Department of Agriculture and Department of the Interior. For the most part, plans and specifications are available for the construction projects, and all that has to be done is award the contracts.

It will not be necessary to engage architects or to do anything else which will take a great deal of time. The work is available and ready if Congress will provide the money.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$3,879,350" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,109,350."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my hope that action can be taken to provide the necessary funds to equip the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to expand an important fish hatchery at Creston, Mont., to take care of the increased demand for trout and other fish.

The May issue of the National Geographic has a wonderful article on our national parks by Conrad Wirth, Director of the Park Service. It is entitled "Heritage of Beauty and History." As I read it last night, I was struck by the opening lines where Mr. Wirth related the need to inspect our parks. He told of the necessity of settling an argument on whether to stock a trout stream in Glacier National Park in my State of Montana.

This is a real and pressing problem because we do not have enough trout in Glacier to meet the demands of the expanding number of fishermen who seek to enjoy Isaak Walton's sport in the scenic and inspiring grandeur of this magnificent park. The Park Service cannot solve this problem because the fish that are needed must come in large measure from the Creston fish hatchery, managed by a sister agency in the Department of the Interior—the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. This hatchery is the only one in Montana that requires major improvement. It has been in operation since 1939 and it has not developed to its full potential. I ask unanimous consent that a letter that I have received from the Whitefish Rod and Gun Club and a justification for these funds be inserted in the record at the close of my remarks. It would take only \$230,000 to expand this hatchery, and with this small sum the capacity could be doubled.

I sincerely hope that the committee will give the proposal its very serious and thoughtful consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement and correspondence relative to the fish hatchery be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Federal fish hatchery at Creston, Mont., was constructed in 1939 and operated

jointly by the National Park Service and Fish and Wildlife Service until transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service in 1944. The Creston hatchery was not developed to full potential at the time of establishment. Since that time, construction funds in the following amounts have been provided for improvements at the hatchery:

Fiscal year 1957 (construction of trout raceways).....	\$18,000
Fiscal year 1958 (storage building).....	15,000

To fully develop the Creston hatchery to its full potential would require the items included in the following improvement and expansion program:

Fish-food preparation and cold-storage building.....	\$52,000
Raceways	80,000
Replace troughs with concrete tanks and 20 hatching troughs.....	9,000
2 sets of quarters with garages.....	30,000
Replace water-supply line to spring.....	30,000
Domestic water supply and sewage system	4,000
Construct bridge.....	5,000
Engineering and contingencies.....	20,000
Total.....	230,000

The Creston hatchery has produced an average of 52,000 pounds of trout (cutthroat, rainbow and brook) annually during the past 3 years. An improvement and expansion program, as outlined above, would almost double the capacity of rearing facilities at the hatchery.

JUSTIFICATION

The Federal fish hatchery at Creston, Mont., was established in 1939 to provide fingerling trout for stocking waters in Glacier National Park. In the last 10 years, however, because of increased tourist travel and greater emphasis placed upon the sport of fishing as a source of relaxation, the fishing pressure on trout populations in the waters of northwestern Montana has become much greater. Thus the Creston hatchery is now required to restock waters in a large area in northwestern Montana in addition to its assignment of maintaining trout populations in Glacier National Park waters. The construction of Hungry Horse Dam has added to the problem of maintaining the fishery resource of the area. The fishing pressure has increased to the point where many streams must be restocked with legal-sized trout in order to maintain populations.

The Creston hatchery is in need of a major improvement program which will provide facilities for expanding production, especially that of legal-sized trout. The hatchery is operated in close cooperation with Montana State Fish and Game Commission, and the fish produced are assigned to areas selected in accordance with approved management plans. Existing facilities are not adequate to permit the increased production necessary to meet present commitments, and it is believed that requirements will increase annually.

There are four Federal hatcheries in Montana. The units at Ennis and Bozeman have received funds in recent years for major improvements. At Miles City, funds are available for construction of a new hatchery. Only the Creston hatchery in Montana requires major improvement.

WHITEFISH ROD AND GUN CLUB,
Whitefish, Mont., April 25, 1958.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Our district is very much interested in the expansion of our Creston fish-cultural station, as the present fish output is scarcely adequate to meet our fishing pressures which supplies Glacier National Park and a large surrounding area.

As chairman of the fish committee for the Rod and Gun Club and also the chamber of commerce, I have recently visited the regional directors office in Portland, Oreg., and enclosed is a copy of their letter itemizing expenditures necessary to fully develop the Creston station hatchery.

It is our understanding that funds are available for fish hatchery development and we wish to express the urgent need for further expansion of our Creston station.

Your sincere cooperation in this matter will be greatly appreciated, and we await your reply with interest.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH Z. GERBER,
Chairman, Fish Committee.
ARTHUR GOLIE,
President, Rod and Gun Club.
D. R. RAMSHAW,
President, Chamber of Commerce.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE,
Portland, Oreg., April 16, 1958.

Mr. J. Z. GERBER,
Whitefish, Mont.

DEAR MR. GERBER: During your visit to our office the plans for the expansion of our Creston station were discussed and we agreed to furnish you with a list of the items required for the development of the hatchery.

This year we are building a storage building that is presently out on bid that will house the station's vehicles and distribution units. It will cost in the neighborhood of \$15,000.

Last year we constructed six new raceway ponds which increased the capacity of the station. These ponds cost in the neighborhood of \$18,000.

To fully develop this station, the following items are needed:

Fish food preparation and cold storage building, estimated cost, \$52,000.

Additional raceway ponds, \$80,000.

Replacement of hatchery troughs with concrete tanks, \$9,000.

Two additional residences for employees, \$30,000.

Additional water-supply lines and sewage-disposal units, \$34,000.

Miscellaneous items, such as a bridge across the creek, engineering, and contingencies, estimated at \$25,000.

If construction funds become available for the items listed, the station would be in a better position to produce sufficient legalized trout to adequately take care of the hatchery's zone of responsibility. Naturally, if the above facilities were provided, the operation allotment for the station would have to be increased in order to provide sufficient personnel and expenses for rearing larger numbers of fish.

We trust that the above information fulfills your request for data on our Creston fish-cultural station.

Sincerely yours,

J. T. BARNABY,
Chief, Division of Sport Fisheries.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Senator from Montana will not press his amendment, so that the committee may be afforded an opportunity to look into the project during its hearings on the supplemental appropriation bill. The project was not considered by the committee in the hearings on the pending bill. If he will withdraw his amendment I can assure him that at the appropriate time it will be given the careful attention of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the chairman of the committee. I would have

presented the amendment to the committee, but I received the communication regarding it only within the past several days, since the bill has been reported. With the assurance of the chairman of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Montana withdraws his amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to cover an emergency situation with regard to a spillway on an Indian reservation which was washed out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "\$40,526,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$40,571,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I may say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that the change would involve \$45,000. It would be used to replace a spillway which was washed out at the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation near Wounded Knee, S. Dak. The dam is a 70,000 cubic-foot dirt-fill dam. Obviously it is of no use at the present time and the Government's investment is standing idle. I would have presented the matter to the committee earlier, but I was unable to get the figure on the cost of the repair work until the first of this week. I had written for it earlier. I may say that the dam is on a live stream, which runs the year around. It is near an Indian school. It also provides some recreation. There is a limited amount of irrigation with respect to some gardens. I would appreciate it if the committee would accept the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator spoke to me about the matter yesterday. I suggested that he speak to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. If it meets with his approval, I will have no objection to including it in the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, my colleague did speak to me about, and I am familiar with, the situation and the problem presented. It is a very desirable item and should be incorporated in the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection to the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a more extended statement with regard to the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. CASE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

The purpose of the amendment is to provide \$45,000 for replacement of a spillway at the Wounded Knee Dam on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, S. Dak. This dam, involving 70,000 cubic yards of earth fill, is located on a live stream which flows the year round. The original concrete chute spillway, with a small mechanical outlet, proved inadequate and went out some

time ago, and the entire value of the dam and reservoir has therefore been lost until this repair can be made.

Under date of March 25, 1958, I asked the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for a report on requirements for restoration of the spillway. The reply of the acting area director, dated April 17, 1958, was forwarded to me by Assistant Commissioner E. J. Utz under date of April 24, and was received the first of the week, which accounts for my inability to present the matter to the Appropriations Subcommittee during the time that it was conducting its hearings.

The area director's report states that although there is a very limited acreage of irrigable land below the dam, it does have considerable recreational value. His statement to the Commissioner as relayed to me says, in part:

"The lake would provide particular recreational advantages to the Wounded Knee Day School and the Wounded Knee community as it is located only a mile below the school and community area. Well-maintained gravel roads parallel the south edge of the lake site making it easily accessible to the population of the surrounding towns of Martin, Pine Ridge, and Kadoka. The Wounded Knee Dam is of considerable size involving approximately 70,000 cubic yards of earth fill. It is located in a scenic area which would be conducive to camping, boating, fishing, and general outdoor recreation. The estimated cost of replacing the spillway on this structure would amount to approximately \$45,000. The Wounded Knee Creek on which the dam is located is a live stream which flows year long."

In view of the fact that the Government at one time invested considerable money in this dam with a 70,000-cubic-foot fill and is getting no returns whatever because of the loss of the spillway and because of the great value that it would be to the nearby Indian community and Indian school as well as the many people who live in the towns mentioned by the area director, it seems to me only good business that the Government should repair the spillway and thereby restore the reservoir and lake for the use indicated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$3,879,350" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,929,350."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the amendment calls for an increase of \$50,000. I discussed the matter with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. It would enable the project to get under way by the acquisition of land. The authorization bill was passed recently, but too late for the Bureau of the Budget to act upon it. It has been approved by the Department of the Interior. Unless the land is acquired, no progress can be made. This will leave the major expenditures, such as the construction of the proposed buildings, and so forth, to be considered later by the committee. However, unless we can get the money for the acquisition of the land, the whole matter will be held up for another year. I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to say to the chairman of the committee that the

Senator from Arkansas did discuss this matter with me yesterday. As I understand, this is a going project. An effort is being made to find a better use for rice land when it is not being used for growing rice. The amendment would expedite action in the field of research and experimentation and helpfulness. It does not involve any new buildings at this time. On that basis, I am willing to have the amendment included in the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Under the circumstances, I have no objection to the amendment the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, has approved. It is essential to get the program started, and it does not involve any excessive expenditure this year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. The committee will have full opportunity, as will the Bureau of the Budget, to examine into additional expenditures. The amendment will merely make possible the acquisition of land so as to get the project under way, and will enable the planning of the project. The committee has already allowed \$30,000 for planning, but nothing can be planned unless there is something in the nature of a site to enable the project to proceed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a more complete statement concerning this item, a letter I have received from Assistant Secretary of the Interior Ross Leffler; and an article entitled "Fish in the Ricefields," written by Hart Stilwell, and published in *Coronet* magazine for May 1958.

There being no objection, the statement, letter, and article were ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

The amendment merely increases the appropriation for the Fish and Wildlife Service by the amount of \$50,000. The appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior for fiscal year 1959, H. R. 10746, already contains an item of \$30,000 to be used for an engineering survey of a proposed fish research facility for the rice areas of Arkansas.

In the last session of the Congress, I sponsored a bill, S. 1552, which authorized and directed the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, to construct and maintain a research and experiment station to carry on studies relating to fish farming. It was unanimously passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives, and was signed by the President on March 15 of this year. It is now Public Law 85-342.

The bill was signed into law by the President after the Department of the Interior had submitted its budget requests to the Congress. For that reason, no appropriation was made for this activity by the House of Representatives. However, I appeared before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee to request funds for the fish research station, and the committee included the item of \$30,000 to initiate planning and surveys.

The amendment would make available an additional \$50,000 to be used by the Department to acquire a site on which the experiment station is to be located and would provide funds for some of the expenses incidental to the land acquisition.

This is a very small item, but it is extremely important to the people of my State,

and, indeed, to the rice farmers of this Nation. Fish farming has been developed in this country primarily by the farmers on their own initiative. They have not had the benefit of assistance from governmental sources. It is, of course, impossible for each individual farmer to conduct programs of research and experimentation to provide the information needed to make fish farming a profitable operation. They have been plagued with many problems to which no answers are readily available, such as the type of fish best suited for this kind of operation; methods of stocking, feeding, treating, and avoiding diseases; marketing methods; and so forth. The additional item of \$50,000 would guarantee that this program will proceed in an orderly manner.

The Department of the Interior has indicated to the Congress that it could effectively use \$213,000 for this project. However, the amendment which I have offered merely increases the appropriation by the amount of \$50,000. I am hopeful that the \$30,000 which is included in the bill at the present time for planning and surveys, together with the additional \$50,000 which my amendment proposes, will enable the Department to proceed with this important work, and will place it in a position to complete the planning of the project and acquire a site by the time we consider the next Department of Interior appropriation bill. If this can be done, this project could be completed and in operation in a year, or perhaps 18 months.

UNITED STATES

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1958.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: This will acknowledge your letter of March 27 concerning the desirability of securing an appropriation to carry out the purpose of Public Law 85-342 which the President signed on March 15. You will recall, I am sure, that the Department reported favorably on your bill S. 1552, which has now become law.

We feel there are good possibilities through research for the development of scientific fish husbandry of warm-water species which can contribute to the domestic food supply.

Preliminary study for the work is being done, and the station and laboratory will be planned for completion within a 2-year period. Site selection and acquisition, development of a dependable water supply, and the necessary facilities will consume much of the first year. Concurrently, we would start to assemble the staff of specialists for the work and to arrange for their familiarization with the area, the agricultural situation, and for discussions with local institutions for development of definitive, coordinated programs. Actual construction will require several months after contracting is completed, and we might expect to be in full operation toward the end of the second year.

Budgets for initiating the work authorized by Public Law 85-342 will be given consideration along with other Department needs and within the fiscal policy.

Sincerely yours,

ROSS LEFFLER,
Assistant Secretary.

[From *Coronet* of May 1958]

FISH IN THE RICEFIELDS

(By Hart Stilwell)

There's a brandnew industry in the land—raising fish in the rice fields.

Some refer to it as fish husbandry. But by any name you choose to call it, to most Americans it tops them all in weird crop rotation—rice 2 years, then carp and catfish

2 years, then rice again, and so on. Actually, it is almost as old as agriculture itself, since it was practiced in China more than 4,000 years ago. And if the supply of ricefield fish were suddenly cut off, millions of people in the Orient would starve.

Right now, this venture is proving a bonanza to rice farmers in Arkansas, and 250 of them have banded together in the Arkansas Fish Farmers Cooperative to promote the industry. Members have more than 60,000 acres planted to fish, and they have been trying, through the help of the University of Arkansas, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas, and others, to gain approval for a \$500,000 Federal fish-farming experiment station in Arkansas.

So fish farming is with us, and destined to spread to millions of acres of ricelands, then to cotton lands and soybean lands and other flatlands that are irrigated.

There are two sound reasons for this. First, the fish crop brings a good profit from land that otherwise would lie idle. Second, land on which fish have been raised invariably produces about twice as much rice, and without fertilization. At current prices, this means an additional \$125 gross income per acre.

Thomas Wayne Wright, United States Soil Conservation expert at Lonoke, Ark., who is working with the fish farmers, cites the typical experience of George Ryland of the Pinchback Planting Co., of Grady, who harvested 100 bushels of rice an acre on a 65-acre farm after 2 years of fish farming, without doing any fertilizing. Prior to fish growing, the yield had been 55 bushels an acre, with fertilizing. He also harvested 500 pounds of fish per acre, mostly buffalo (a large fish of the sucker family) for which he received 15 cents a pound.

J. L. Huffer, of England, Ark., has not only increased the yield on his 640-acre farm from 50 to 100 bushels an acre by fish farming, but he has found that the fish, particularly buffalo and carp, actually do his plowing as well as his fertilizing.

They root around in the bottom so much that all Huffer does now in planting is sow rice from an airplane. He doesn't go to the expense and trouble of disking the land.

Huffer says that if fish are left on the land longer than 3 years, the soil becomes so rich it must be planted to something other than rice the first year. Rice will grow too rank and yield little.

Fish enrich the soil in at least two ways that biologists and soil analysts know of: they increase the supply of nitrogen by as much as 2 percent; and by eating vegetable growth, insects and other creatures in and on the water, they increase the amount of organic matter in the soil.

Also, the fish and the standing water combine in killing off weeds, the curse of the rice grower and the main reason he must let his land remain idle for a year or two after several crops.

This new industry started by accident in the flatlands around Stuttgart, Ark. Several farmers pumped water from fishponds onto their rice fields and were astonished at the big increase in yield, which in some places jumped from 55 to 134 bushels an acre.

Then others farmers, using the standard Arkansas lowland method of killing timber by flooding the land for 3 years or so, were equally amazed at the mighty fish population on their flooded lands. Many made a neat profit charging sports fishermen to fish; others gathered up the fish and sold them when they drained the land.

The obvious next step was actual fish farming.

In the Orient, where fish farming is older than the written word, fantastic harvests are reported, at times up to 8,000 pounds an acre. But that is achieved by flooding

the land with sewage, a method not acceptable in this country.

Dr. John W. White, of the University of Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station, who is working on fish farming, believes a yield of about 500 pounds to an acre should be achieved by the American fish farmer as soon as he gets onto the knack of this new kind of farming—that is, 500 pounds in 2 years. It takes most species now being used—carp, buffalo, catfish, bass—about 2 years to reach commercial size. A carp, for instance, may grow to weigh eight or ten pounds in that time; a bass may reach two pounds.

Arkansas farmers are not certain yet which kind of fish is going to turn out best. It may be some "foreigner", such as the tilapia, a favorite in fish farming in Japan and now being studied in this country.

Malcolm Johnson, who left his job with the Soil Conservation Service to open a fish hatchery at Tillar, Ark., to supply seed stock to farmers, thinks the ideal combination is big-mouth buffalo—a tough native fish sometimes called gourdhead—and large-mouth black bass. (Arkansas, to encourage fish farming, changed her law and is the first State to permit the sale of "home-grown" bass.)

Johnson says a good average yield on a buffalo-bass combination should be 500 pounds of buffalo and 50 pounds of bass. The buffalo usually sells for 18 cents a pound; bass for 35 or 40.

A few rice farmers have experimented with something closely resembling the "feeding-out" process in handling livestock. These farmers stock fish, usually catfish, on their land when they flood it for the rice crop, then harvest the fish along with the rice, turning a quick but small profit on this feeding-out process. But the general practice is to flood the land for 2 years and let the fish really grow.

There are problems, literally dozens of them, linked with this new venture. And there are byproducts, some of which are of far more interest to millions of Americans than the fish farming itself.

Fish farmers have had difficulty getting seed stock and plenty of trouble harvesting their crop. Then there are diseases among fish, and the danger of cold. But all these problems are being studied.

As for byproducts—thousands of sports fishermen are going to start roaming the rice paddies, looking for bass and other game fish—for a fee. Duck hunters will thank the fish farmers for vastly increased feeding and resting areas for waterfowl. And, as Dr. White explains, fish farming is of tremendous value in conserving and using both our water and soil to the fullest.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I congratulate the chairman of the committee and the members of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations on their constructive work on this important bill. I refer in particular to their recommendations concerning the Forest Service, and especially the section of the bill pertaining to forestry research.

Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of all Senators at this moment, because I wish to refer them to a picture mounted in the rear of the Chamber. The picture is of a bristle cone pine tree in California. It was sent to me by Mr. Millard Barnum of the United States

Forest Service. This fine tree has been established as being the oldest living thing in the world. It has been scientifically established that not only this particular tree, but also a few other trees in the same locality, are about 4,600 years old. Thus they are the oldest living things in the world.

I believe, however, that the results of the work of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], in promoting forestry research and other forestry programs will live longer than that pine tree has already lived. He is looking at least that far into the future in genetics research and other phases of forestry research, which are so sorely needed. So I commend him, as I think the Nation does also, for the splendid work he has done, not only in this field, but in many others.

I wish to speak briefly about one or two other outstanding pieces of work done by the United States Forest Service in the field of genetics research as it concerns trees. The Service has three principal stations: Rhinelander, Wis.; Placerville, Calif.; and Gulfport, Miss. I visited the California and Mississippi stations and have an on-the-ground, working knowledge of their important work.

The Wisconsin Research Center has developed new and better varieties of timber species which grow in the northern area of the Nation. The California and Mississippi centers are devoted largely to research in developing better varieties of pine trees. Even though the process is a long one, they are, as rapidly as possible, developing a super pine tree which will have many superior qualities. The super tree, a hybrid, will have bred into it qualities which will make it more disease resistant and more insect resistant, as well as making it more adaptable to some soils, and assuring a faster rate of growth and a higher production of pulp wood or timber per acre.

In the decades to come, the results of this important research will have a powerful impact on the economy of the Nation. In addition, the work will make possible tremendous strides in meeting the rapidly increasing timber demands.

The bill also provides funds for extended tree-planting and better management of forest lands for the production of timber, the conservation of water, and forage management practices for various areas.

One of the most critical needs is that for better physical facilities for the vital research programs, more laboratory space, additional greenhouses, and related research installations. These installations are not expensive at all, but they are absolutely essential. Time is running out on us for work of this kind.

In its newly published volume entitled "Timber Resources for America's Future," the Forest Service points out that by 1975, which is just around the corner, we shall be cutting down each year about 14 percent more timber than is being produced, and shall be losing about 9.6 billion board-feet a year.

Further estimates are that by the year 2000 we shall be losing up to 80.2 billion board-feet annually. Each year we shall

be cutting 76 percent more of our timber than is being produced.

Again, I express great gratitude to the chairman and the members of the subcommittee and commend them for their special attention to a very inexpensive but far-reaching, nationwide program along this line.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I associate myself with what the Senator from Mississippi has said. I, too, thank the chairman and other members of the committee for what they have done by providing \$60,000 additional at Crossett and Harrison stations in Arkansas to provide for research in forestry.

I assure them that I am positive this is a good investment, one which will be returned many times over in the value of the increased production of the national forests alone. Moreover, the research will aid the private forests in that area many times over the amount which has been included in the bill.

I congratulate the committee. I think the country owes them a great debt for their foresight in enabling the natural resources to be preserved as will be done by this bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Arkansas.

Minnesota, too, has a great land area which is suited to the growing of trees. We have a high rate of tree growth for pulpwood, forest products, and timber production. So I am always vitally interested in forest research activities. In fact, research is the new frontier of this era or this century.

More and more tree harvesting is being done because of the increased demand for timber products. So the future holds a vast opportunity for wise development, through research, of hybrid trees, if we will but set our minds to the responsibilities and the tasks.

The Bureau of Mines, also, conducts similar research projects. I refer specifically to the research facilities in the mining areas of northern Minnesota, where there are extensive mineral deposits. Taconite low-grade ore is locked up in the rocks. Thirty years ago it was thought to be an overburden, involving the expense of removal in order to reach the higher grade ore deposits. But now in northern Minnesota there are in the taconite field great iron ore developments, involving the crushing and pulverizing of the rock and the extraction of the mineral from the rock deposit. An industry is being developed which promises to continue into future generations.

All this has been accomplished by research. Therefore, every opportunity to develop the additional resources of our Nation through research should be encouraged.

That is why I am glad to join with the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Arkansas in paying tribute to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], for the work he has done with respect to forestry development. The Senator from Arizona can be found in the Committee on Appropriations

room in the forenoon and afternoon, day after day, throughout the entire legislative session. He is one of the most energetic, hard-working Senators I know. I pay tribute to him. There is nothing which concerns him more than does research, because he knows that the opportunities in that field are unlimited.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Mississippi, and the Senator from Arkansas.

The budget estimate for research is \$12,128,000. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$16,728,000. The recommended increase of \$4,600,000 will provide:

First, \$2,600,000 for the strengthening of research programs throughout the country. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the tabulation on pages 30 and 31 of the Senate report, setting forth the recommended increases for forestry research.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Project	Recommended research program increases
Forest genetics, seed and planting research:	
Gulfport, Miss. (genetics)-----	70,000
Placerville, Calif. (genetics)-----	70,000
Rhineland, Wis. (genetics)-----	70,000
Lake City, Fla.-----	75,000
Marianna, Fla.-----	15,000
Macon, Ga. (seed and nursery)-----	75,000
Bottineau, N. Dak. (shelterbelt planting)-----	35,000
Corvallis, Oreg. (seed orchards)-----	15,000
Subtotal-----	425,000
Timber management:	
Stoneville, Miss.-----	75,000
Alexandria, La.-----	75,000
Crossett, Ark.-----	60,000
Harrison, Ark.-----	60,000
Columbia, Mo.-----	75,000
Charleston, S. C.-----	60,000
North Carolina (Bent Creek and Statesville)-----	50,000
Virginia (Piedmont)-----	60,000
Grand Rapids, Minn.-----	60,000
Carbondale, Ill.-----	35,000
Warren, Pa. (Kane Experimental Forest)-----	50,000
Lebanon, N. J.-----	40,000
Berea Research Center, Ky.-----	30,000
Subtotal-----	730,000
Range management and wildlife habitat research:	
Fresno, Calif. (San Joaquin Range)-----	35,000
Boise, Idaho (for cheatgrass range)-----	30,000
Grand Junction, Colo.-----	15,000
Washington, D. C. (recreation-wildlife habitat)-----	12,000
Subtotal-----	92,000
Watershed management research:	
Arizona (mixed conifer area)-----	60,000
La Crosse, Wis.-----	60,000
Laramie, Wyo.-----	60,000
Glendora, Calif. (San Dimas)-----	60,000
Franklin, N. C.-----	20,000
Oxford, Miss.-----	20,000
Columbus, Ohio-----	20,000
Albuquerque, N. Mex.-----	40,000
East Lansing, Mich.-----	50,000
Subtotal-----	390,000

Project—Continued

Project	Recommended research program increases
Forest fire research:	
Missoula, Mont.-----	\$100,000
Macon, Ga.-----	100,000
Subtotal-----	200,000
Forest insects research:	
Albuquerque, N. Mex.-----	50,000
East Lansing, Mich.-----	25,000
Dutch elm disease in New England-----	18,000
Subtotal-----	93,000
Economic research: Feasibility survey of a newsprint pilot papermill to utilize low-quality hardwoods-----	20,000
Forest utilization research:	
Forest Products Laboratory, Madison, Wis.-----	100,000
Carbondale, Ill.-----	50,000
Subtotal-----	150,000
Total, research program and urgent facilities-----	2,100,000

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the recommended increase will provide, second, \$2,500,000 for the construction of needed research facilities at Gulfport, Miss.; Placerville, Calif.; Rhineland, Wis.; Grand Rapids, Minn.; Lake City, Fla.; Rapid City, S. Dak.; Missoula, Mont.; and Columbus, Ohio.

With a few minor modifications, the research program recommended by the committee is the one recommended to the committee by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who is a member of the National Forest Reservation Commission. He made an extensive tour of the national forests following the last session of Congress, and subsequently presented to the committee a program for the expansion of forest research. The committee found this program to be a very reasonable one; and, as I have stated, the committee adopted it with only minor changes.

At the hearing, when the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture was present, I made the following statement:

This increasing trend in timber-sales receipts does not surprise me. When Secretary Benson first took office, I wrote him a letter and told him that it was my opinion that if steps were taken to offer additional timber for sale that it would not be long before such receipts reached \$100 million.

At that time these receipts were about \$65 million a year.

I further stated:

It is my understanding that in the fiscal year 1956 these receipts were \$110 million, so my prediction was correct.

In other words, when we make appropriations of this kind, we are providing for a better development of our natural resources, and you will get your money back. In this case our money comes back in the form of increased timber receipts.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator

from Arizona yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to add a word of appreciation for the consideration the chairman of the committee and the committee gave to the item of research facilities for our timber resources. I should also like to express my appreciation of the consideration given for the saline water research program.

I note that the committee has allowed the amount of the budget estimate, thus restoring the amount of the reduction made by the House of Representatives. Because I believe that, likewise, great returns will be received by the country from it, I believe it important that this item be included.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In connection with the item on page 3, dealing with the "Acquisition of Strategic Minerals," I wonder whether that was recommended or requested by the Department.

Mr. HAYDEN. It was not recommended by the Department, but there is authority of law for it.

The amendment provides for an appropriation for necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956. It is estimated that approximately \$2,318,000 will be required for the fluorspar program, and the remainder will be required for the asbestos program.

I understand that on Monday of this week the Secretary of the Interior appeared before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and recommended a new program for our domestic mineral producers.

These funds would implement the asbestos and fluorspar provisions of the existing law which terminates on December 31, 1958.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Although I know the Secretary of the Interior did make such a recommendation, it is my understanding that it has not been evaluated by the committee. Some of us may feel that the recommendation goes too far, although the Congress as a whole may decide to follow it.

Nevertheless, it is my understanding that the adoption of this amendment would have the net effect of partially extending the procurement of these strategic minerals, even without the adoption of any legislation.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is authority of law for it; and if this amendment were to go out on a point of order, I would immediately offer an amendment calling for the appropriation of the money, since it is authorized by law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the use of the unobligated balance would not then be provided for.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. A point of order would lie against the use of the unobligated balance, but not

against appropriations of money authorized by existing law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But we could stop the use of the unobligated balance, and can let that money revert to the Treasury; and we could stop the expenditure of it beyond the period which this bill authorizes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I may say, in respect to fluorspar, that it is found in many places in the United States, but principally in southern Illinois. At the hearings before our committee, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] stated that information had been given to him that fluorine is one of the elements which is highly essential in the missile program; that there will be a tremendous demand for it. So his argument was that we should develop our own domestic fluorine resources rather than depend upon foreign sources.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That may well be; but I think that should be established at the hearings on the bill which is being recommended by the Secretary, and that we should at least have the recommendations of the departments.

Therefore, pending the receipt of that information, I shall be constrained to make a point of order against this portion of the bill; and I would oppose the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Delaware may have forgotten it; but he made a similar point of order once before on the availability of those funds. If the Senator from Delaware does make the point of order, I shall offer an amendment, namely, that the amount of money required for this program, which is authorized by law, be appropriated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the committee amendment on page 3, beginning with line 10, and continuing through line 21, inclusive, is not in order, by virtue of the fact that it constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I concede the point of order.

I send to the desk an amendment and request its immediate consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I request a ruling on the point of order.

Mr. HAYDEN. I concede the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The Chair sustains the point of order of the Senator from Delaware that the amendment constitutes general legislation on an appropriation bill.

The amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 9, it is proposed to insert the following:

ACQUISITION OF STRATEGIC MINERALS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the "Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956" (70 Stat. 579), exclusive of section 2a, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$3,200,000, to remain available until December 31, 1958.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in opposition to the committee amendment,

I merely point out that it provides for the appropriation of \$3,200,000 for the purchase of so-called strategic minerals, not any of which has been recommended by the departments. In fact, on various occasions the representatives of the departments have testified before the committees, and have said they do not need these minerals and, that they already have adequate reserves in the stockpiles.

Until such time as a need for these minerals has been established and until representatives of the departments charged with carrying on the programs have appeared before the Congressional committees and have recommended the acquisition of these minerals, I believe it would be unwise for this money to be spent for a program which, as I have said before, obviously is not needed for the purpose for which it is proposed that the funds be appropriated.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I cannot agree with the Senator from Delaware, because both items are needed.

The asbestos program involves the development of deposits of high-grade asbestos which are free from iron and other minerals. We need a domestic source of this mineral. At the present time 90 percent of our consumption is from foreign sources.

From the testimony given by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I am convinced that the fluorspar is particularly important to our national defense.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I think the Senator from Delaware is primarily concerned with whether any additional funds are provided for the acquisition of tungsten by the Government. Can the Senator from Arizona give the Senator from Delaware some assurances on that point?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not a cent of this money is for the acquisition of tungsten.

If the pending amendment is agreed to, the bill as thus amended will read in part as follows:

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the "Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956" (70 Stat. 579), exclusive of section 2 (a).

Section 2 (a) is the tungsten section of Public Law 733.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I recognize that point. However, several years ago I incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement from the General Services Administration and statements from Mr. Flemming and from the Secretary of Defense and from representatives of various other departments, all of whom said none of these minerals were needed; and their statements at that time included fluorspar as not being needed.

Mr. HAYDEN. But the situation has changed somewhat since then.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It may have. If so, why have not representatives of the departments appeared before our committees and so stated?

As of this moment, it is my understanding—and if I am in error, I wish the Senator from Arizona would correct me—that at the present time no responsible agency of the United States Gov-

ernment which has charge of the defense or stockpiling programs has been before the committee and has said this is needed for the national defense, or has said that our stockpiles were inadequate. I do not think favorable testimony on this matter has been submitted either to the Appropriations Committee or to any other Congressional committee.

It is true that testimony was given earlier this week in favor of a broad support program for certain minerals. But it was described as a support program to boost the economy, and not to bolster the national defense. I shall have more to say on that proposal later. I repeat that, to my knowledge—and if I am in error, I wish the Senator would correct me and tell me how I am in error—there has been no testimony from any responsible agent of the Government having charge of our stockpiling program or of our defense that there is a need for it in our national stockpiling program.

Mr. HAYDEN. I may point out that it is designed to preserve two industries badly needed in the United States. One has to do with the development of asbestos, particularly on the Pacific coast, where high-grade asbestos is found. The other has to do with the development of fluorspar, which is a source of fluorine, which, according to testimony presented to our committee by the Senator from Illinois, is highly essential for our national defense, and will be in great demand. I think Senators should take cognizance of the fact that there is a need for domestic sources of these two minerals, aside from the stockpiling program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I respect the testimony before the committee by the various Senators. I do not question their sincerity. But I repeat my question: Has there been any testimony before the Senator's committee or any other committee of Congress by any agency or any official in charge of our defense or our stockpiling program who has stated this program is needed?

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me say what I said before: This is not presented as a stockpiling program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate that. I go back to my original contention that, on the contrary, there has been a lot of testimony before the committees that it is not needed. Mr. Fleming went so far as to say it would be a waste of the taxpayers' money. I agree with him.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Secretary of the Interior has testified time and time again that it is in the national interest to develop our domestic sources of these minerals.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Any Senator voting against the appropriation certainly is not voting for abandonment of the industries. We have many industries in this country which are in dire need of help and could stand an appropriation of a few million dollars. The mere fact that we are not appropriating to help an industry which needs money does not mean we are trying to abandon it or eliminate it.

I repeat, I understand there has been no testimony for this program on the

part of any responsible agency of government. On the contrary, there has been repeated testimony by officials saying it is not needed. I close my argument by agreeing with their statement that such an appropriation would be a complete waste of the taxpayers' money by paying for a program for which there is no need.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sorry, but I do not agree.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I was present in the committee hearings when this question arose. The committee discussed it. I feel perfectly justified in supporting the committee's action. I supported it at the time the committee gave consideration to it. There is no question in my mind that the development of fluorspar is desirable, and, indeed, is necessary. We are certainly in need of it. It is a proven fact that we must import fluorspar. If fluorspar is deposited anywhere in this country, as we know it is in southern Illinois, it should be developed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. As a member of the subcommittee handling the Interior appropriation bill, I am fully aware of the profound understanding of the chairman of the subcommittee, who also is chairman of the full Appropriations Committee, and of his interest in the conservation and development of natural resources, primarily in the public land States of the West. I think the increased funds for the management of, and the various programs within, the Forest Service will prove most beneficial in many ways, particularly in increasing revenues through the building of access roads and making available recreation facilities through the Operation Outdoors program.

I am in hearty accord with that program and the impetus which will be given the Forest Service in the development of those programs.

The chairman of the subcommittee has also offered an amendment, which has received approval, providing expanded funds for the construction of Indian schools on reservations—boarding schools and day schools. I have some doubt in my mind as to whether the initiation of this expanded construction program will mean a reversal in the general educational program which has been sponsored during the past decade by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I am sure the Senator approves efforts have been made to integrate the education of Indian children in the public schools of our Nation, in order to provide contacts and to better qualify Indians to assume their full responsibilities. I know the Senator is aware of that policy. I should like to have some assurances from him, at a time when we hear so

much about integration, and as we recognize the equity and fairness involved in providing adequate educational facilities for our Indian children, that there is no Congressional intent to reverse this policy by keeping the Indian children in schools on reservations and out of the public schools of our country.

Mr. HAYDEN. Only yesterday I talked with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. That is the last thing in the world he would want done. I think he is prouder of the efforts he has made and the support he has had from Congress in building dormitories in towns, such, for example, as Gallup, Holbrook, Winslow, and other places, where Indian children who are old enough to be separated from their families can be placed in dormitories and then go to public schools. There they learn as much on the playgrounds as they do in the schools. That is where they get a working knowledge of the English language. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs expressed great pride in the accomplishment of his administration.

The largest increase recommended by the Committee is for the construction program for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The budget recommended \$13 million, and the House allowed \$13,800,000, and the committee recommends \$40,526,000—an increase of \$27,526,000 over the budget estimate. Of the total recommended, \$36,758,000 is for the buildings and utilities program and the balance of \$3,768,000 is for the construction of irrigation systems.

Last year the Department of the Interior presented to the Congress a 10-year program for the construction of education facilities that was designed to provide for adequate schools and related facilities for all Indian children of school age. For the current fiscal year this plan called for a buildings and utilities program totaling \$17 million, and only \$11 million was appropriated. For fiscal 1959 the program calls for \$38 million, and the budget recommends only \$10 million.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the tabulation on page 297 of the Senate hearings, setting out the requirements for this program.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The long-range construction program for buildings and utilities contemplated appropriations in a 10-year period as follows:	
1958-----	\$17,100,000
1959-----	38,000,000
1960-----	51,000,000
1961-----	43,500,000
1962-----	46,000,000
1963-----	46,000,000
1964-----	64,500,000
1965-----	64,500,000
1966-----	71,700,000
1967-----	66,200,000
1968-----	34,000,000

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is the view of the committee that this program should be continued substantially in accordance with the original schedule presented. Therefore, an additional \$27.7 million is recommended.

Much has been said about the termination of Federal supervision over Indians, and I think it is desirable when the individual tribes are ready for such action. However, if we are to have Federal termination we will have to provide education for Indian children.

At the present time 8,000 Indian children of school age are not attending school because of the lack of adequate facilities. The budget estimate would provide accommodations for only 506 additional. The increase recommended by the committee will provide for 3,500 additional seats.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Then the distinguished Senator from Arizona approves of the policy which has been effective for several years, does he?

Mr. HAYDEN. Absolutely.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Wherever possible, Indian children should be enrolled in the public schools to help them to be indoctrinated with Americanism, and to make it possible for them to know the customs of the American people.

Mr. HAYDEN. An Indian child who goes to a public school and who associates with English-speaking children acquires knowledge of the language he could not get in any other way, and acquires it faster.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Those contacts and associations instill confidence in the Indian children, and encourage them to leave the reservations and seek employment, thereby becoming full fledged American citizens.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Indian children find they can successfully compete in the classroom with the white children, and that gives them confidence to go out to successfully compete with white men anywhere.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. So far as the State of Idaho is concerned, all of the Indian schools on reservations have been closed down for several years. I am sure splendid progress has been made by the enrolling of our Indian children in the public schools, giving those Indian children the same educational opportunities which are available to young white Americans.

Mr. HAYDEN. In my judgment the best money we have spent, so far as Indian education is concerned, is the contribution we have made to the States to provide for the education of Indian children in the public schools.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad the Senator from Idaho raised the question, because it is in line with the tenor of the discussion which we had in the executive session of the committee at the time we approved some of the substantial items relating to the education of Indian children. The discussions in the executive sessions of the committee were not a matter of public record and are not in print. I think it is desirable, therefore,

that to review the legislative history, which the Senator from Idaho in his colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the committee has so firmly established.

It is the desire of our subcommittee, and I am sure of the Senate and of the Congress, in making the additional money available for the education of Indian children, to have it used with complete consistency with the splendid program being promoted so aggressively and effectively by Commissioner Glenn Emmons, which contemplated that wherever possible there be a commingling of the Indian children with the white children of the area, and that wherever possible contracts be entered into with States or local school districts for that purpose. In some instances perhaps, the Federal Government will provide the building, and the State or local school district will provide the educators, or sometimes the facilities. It is felt that the schools should be open to the Indian children and open to the white people in the area. The legislation is intended to be written with sufficient flexibility so that the Indian Bureau can utilize its ingenuity and administrative capacity to make the schools in the Indian areas function in such a way as to help the Indian children primarily and essentially by making schools available so that white and Indian children can study together.

As the chairman of the committee pointed out, in some instances the program takes the form of providing dormitories for Indian children in white communities, where the Indian children will have a place to stay and eat, but will be able to go to school with the white children. In some places, it is necessary to erect a school building in cases where there can be a joint arrangement to provide the necessary finances.

Throughout every single appropriation for the education of Indian children and for the construction program, the whole emphasis is upon assuring a continuation of the policy of the Indian Bureau, under Glenn Emmons, to provide for the commingling of the races, the Indians and the whites, because we have found inevitably, when that is done, the Indian children advance much more rapidly.

I am sure the chairman of the committee will agree that the legislative history we are making is a correct summation of our thinking out loud in the executive session of the committee when we considered these matters.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has stated the facts as I understand them to be.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I express again my appreciation of the enlightened position taken by the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee with regard to the education of Indian children. I think we are making progress in that regard.

The principle of encouraging the Indian children to commingle with the white children, or to take their schooling in the regular day schools, is a good one. As evidence of the principle which is involved, I might recite the testimony in regard to my own State which was given a few years ago, by an experienced educator in the Indian school field.

For a number of years in the Indian schools there was a separate and special course of education. It was developed by some person who worked in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, supposedly with the idea of serving the Indians. It was a course of education which was designed to keep the Indian children Indians, so to speak. I personally did not believe in it.

Indian parents who had many children, some of them going to white schools and some to Indian schools, reported to me that their children who mingled with the white children, getting the regular course of study, seemed to do better.

The matter came to a head in connection with an Indian boy I appointed to the Naval Academy at Annapolis. It was found that although he was able to enter the Academy there were certain deficiencies in his fundamental A B C's as a result of having attended Indian schools. This was a great handicap. Although he was a very capable and a very popular boy he was not able to keep up with his work at Annapolis. Eventually he left the Academy. He went into the Marine Corps and got his wings. He became a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

I talked with the mother of the boy afterward, and she wanted to know why the boy could not keep up with the scholastic requirements at the Naval Academy, even though he was able to establish his personal ability when he went into the Marine Corps. I explored that matter. I talked with an Indian mother who had 10 children, 4 of whom had gone to the white schools and 6 of whom had gone to other schools. The mother told me there was no difference in the opportunities the children had at home, but that the children who had gone to the white schools did better.

As a result, I introduced a bill to make it possible for the South Dakota course of study to be taught in the Indian schools where a majority of the parents or the patrons of the school desired to have that done. The bill was resisted at the time by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I had introduced the bill on a general basis. Finally it was agreed that the bill might be approved if its application were restricted to South Dakota. I accepted that as a compromise.

As a result of the legislation, referenda were instituted in many schools. I was interested in hearing the statement of Mr. Newport, who was for a number of years the superintendent of the Indian School System at the Rosebud and Pine Ridge Indian Agency. Mr. Newport told me that in every single case where a referendum was instituted the parents of the children voted to have the South Dakota course of study used in preference to the one which had been carried on for some time by the

Indian Bureau. The parents wanted the children to be able to mix in the community and not feel they were handicapped, a feeling they had when they received a different and a sort of specialized type of education. The result was that the South Dakota course of study has been largely used in the Indian schools.

I cite that as an illustration of the soundness of the principle to which the committee has indicated its preference by providing for dormitories or other facilities, so that the Indian children, as soon as they reach a proper age or have the facilities, can follow a regular course of study. I think that is the proper approach.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I desire to commend warmly the Committee on Appropriations, and especially the distinguished chairman of the committee, for forward-looking vision in the work on the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies. The bill represents a responsible and constructive regard for wise development and utilization of our natural resources.

I am particularly interested, from the standpoint of my State, in the wise consideration that is shown to forestry research. Wisconsin's forests were her first great natural resource; they have been depleted to a large extent by the present time, but with good management and careful development, forest industries can be greatly magnified in importance to our overall economy, to the great benefit of the entire Nation.

The appropriation bill provides for the first step toward realization of my proposal for a pilot-plant newsprint mill to utilize low-quality hardwoods for producing newsprint paper.

I have introduced a bill to authorize establishment of a demonstration pilot-plant papermill project, to be carried out by a commercial paper manufacturing firm in cooperation with Forest Service scientists. This pilot-plant project would work out the final details, in actual commercial-scale operation, of the new process for manufacturing newsprint from low-quality hardwoods. It would open the door for widespread use of this abundant Wisconsin resource, for which there is now little or no market.

The Appropriations Committee's recommendation of funds to finance a preliminary feasibility survey of such a project will greatly shorten the time that would be needed to get such a project under way and into actual operation once it has won final Congressional approval.

This bill also permits vast improvement in the operations of three important forestry research projects in Wisconsin—the Northern Forestry Genetics Institute at Rhinelander; the watershed management research project in southwestern Wisconsin, headquartered at La Crosse; and the Forests Products Laboratory in Madison.

The Northern Forest Genetics Institute at Rhinelander is given a far greater opportunity to operate than the administration permitted. The bill provides \$200,000 for construction of research facilities at the Rhinelander Institute; no funds for this purpose were proposed by the administration. And the bill provides \$105,000 for actual research work at the Rhinelander Institute—an increase of 200 percent above the administration's recommendation of only \$35,000.

The science of forest genetics might completely transform our northern forests. Scientists believe that spectacular improvements in rate-of-growth, quality, and disease and insect resistance of forest trees can be achieved by genetics research. One has only to consider the tremendous improvements made in corn during the last few decades as a result of scientific genetics work, for example, to appreciate the possibilities.

The bill provides \$400,000 for construction of an urgently needed new heating plant at the Forest Products Laboratory in Madison, and \$100,000 more than the administration requested for salaries for scientific and technical personnel at the Forest Products Laboratory.

The bill greatly expands the opportunity for forestry research in connection with watersheds in the hilly, unglaciated area of southwestern Wisconsin. Forestry management in the region is directly tied in with its unusually severe flood-control problems. The increase for this project from \$15,000 to \$75,000 will permit a real start to be made on this important project.

I very much thank the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to join my colleagues in thanking the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and members of the committee for their foresight, and for what I believe is their prudent allocation of much needed funds.

I was particularly pleased to note that in connection with the National Park Service the committee recommended a substantial increase in terms of construction funds for the National Park Service program. I have always taken an interest in our national parks. I intend to visit one or more of them this year again, as a citizen, as a head of a family, as a dad with his sons and daughters.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee recommendation of \$24 million for the construction program of the National Park Service is an increase of \$11,600,000 over the budget estimate of \$12,400,000. It is the view of the committee that the sum recommended is required in order to continue the 10-year development program—known as Mission 66, for our national parks.

Of the total recommended, \$22,406,000 is for the construction of buildings and utilities and the balance of \$1,593,200 is for the acquisition of lands and water rights.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the tabulation on page 70 of the Senate hearings setting forth the 1959 requirements to continue the Mission 66 program.

This tabulation indicates that a building and utilities program of \$22.3 million is required, and the committee has recommended a program totaling \$22.4 million.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Tabulation showing amounts needed in 1959
fiscal year to keep Mission 66 on schedule

	Budget allowance, 1959	Original estimate, 1959	Difference
Management and protection.....	\$14,632,000	\$17,200,000	\$2,568,000
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities.....	12,000,000	12,750,000	750,000
General administrative expenses.....	1,330,000	1,525,000	195,000
Construction:			
Buildings, utilities, and other facilities.....	10,806,800	22,318,800	11,512,000
Acquisition of lands and water rights.....	1,593,200	2,181,200	588,000
Subtotal.....	40,362,000	55,975,000	15,613,000
Construction (liquidation of contract authorization):			
Parkways.....	9,782,000	16,000,000	6,218,000
Roads and trails.....	12,218,000	16,000,000	3,782,000
Subtotal (liquidation of contract authorization).....	22,000,000	32,000,000	10,000,000
Total, National Park Service.....	62,362,000	87,975,000	25,613,000

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the chairman of the committee that this is a great public service, and one which people everywhere will deeply appreciate.

I also thank the Senator for the appropriation for the Bureau of Mines laboratory construction, which means so much to the State of Minnesota, to the Middle West, and to the Nation, as a whole. This particular laboratory has been an item of interest to me as long as I have been a Member of the Senate.

I have also noticed that the funds for Federal grants-in-aid to State nurseries were increased to the amount which was available last year and for the current fiscal year. This is very desirable. We are finding that one of the great shortages in the conservation-reserve program sponsored by the Department of Agriculture is in respect to trees and saplings. The State nursery program is a vital part of our total reforestation effort.

I note from the report that there was an increase of \$200,000 in the item for the Lake States Forestry Laboratory at Grand Rapids, Minn. This is of great importance to our forest program and our timber program.

I also note that funds for the Quetico-Superior National Forest land purchases in the wilderness area provide another \$300,000. The gratitude of every conservation group in America goes out to the committee for its foresight, because the Quetico-Superior area is one of the few virgin timber areas on the continent,

and we hope to be able to develop the Quetico-Superior program to its full completion.

I thank the Senator and the other members of the committee for their helpfulness.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to join the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Wisconsin in their observations with respect to the sums provided for in the Interior Department appropriation bill regarding related agencies, such as the Forest Service.

I also desire to add what seems to me a very pertinent and important fact. I believe that our debt to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and his associates is heightened by the circumstance that in recent years the Soviet Union has been undertaking what may possibly be the most comprehensive program of resource development ever planned in any country in history.

As a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs I was startled—and I know my colleagues shared the amazement—by what we were told by Gen. E. C. Itschner, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and others who have returned from European Russia and Siberia, about what the Soviet Union is undertaking with respect to its waters, forest resources, minerals, and all the other vast resources of a nation the area of which is 2½ times greater than that of the United States plus Alaska.

So when we preserve the resources of the United States, we are conducting programs not only for our own benefit, but for the benefit of the entire Free World.

I was particularly pleased that \$1.5 million was added for reforestation and stand improvement in the Forest Service. This is of special importance to the State of Oregon, which has the most valuable national forests in the country, and in which more lumbering is done commercially than anywhere else in the Nation.

In addition, I was delighted—and I am sure other Senators from Western States share my gratification—that the Appropriations Committee added \$3 million to Operation Outdoors. Earlier the distinguished chairman of the committee referred to Mission 66 in the National Park Service. If I am not mistaken, Operation Outdoors is to the national forests what Mission 66 is to the national parks. Operation Outdoors seeks to improve campgrounds, trails, shelters, picnic grounds, and other areas in the national forests where people can find recreation.

Mr. HAYDEN. In that connection, the recommendations of the committee include \$11,020,000 for the development and maintenance of recreational and public use areas in the national forests, which is an increase of \$3 million over the budget estimate.

In reporting the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1957, the committee made the following statement in

its report—Senate Report No. 1772, 84th Congress:

The committee has recommended funds to initiate a long-range program for the improvement of the national parks. It is the view of the committee that the Forest Service should present a program of this nature, and that funds to implement such a program should be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for consideration in the budget for fiscal year 1958.

Such a program—known as Operation Outdoors was submitted to the Congress.

During the course of the hearings I discussed this program with officials of the Forest Service and they pointed out that the planned program included \$11,500,000 for the current fiscal year and only \$8,020,000 was appropriated; that for fiscal 1959 the program called for \$15,500,000 and the budget included only \$8,020,000.

If we are to continue this program it is imperative that additional funds be provided. During last year there were 61 million visitors to these recreational areas in the national forests, and the number continues to increase annually.

Adequate facilities, such as water and sanitation, must be provided. Also it is essential from the standpoint of management and protection of the forests that we have these developed areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the tabulation on page 526 of the hearings.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Operation Outdoors—Recreation—public use comparison of planned program with available funds

	Planned program	Amount available	Difference
Fiscal year 1958....	\$11,500,000	\$8,020,000	—\$3,480,000
Fiscal year 1959....	15,500,000	8,020,000	—7,480,000
Total.....	27,000,000	16,040,000	—10,960,000

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I believe that even more people visit the national forests today than visit the national parks.

Mr. HAYDEN. My information is that the number is about the same.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask one further question with respect to the amount added to the appropriation for Operation Outdoors. Was it the thought of the chairman of the committee that in programming the locations where funds are to be spent, some consideration should be given to the local unemployment factor, in distinguishing between two areas of equal recreational importance?

Mr. HAYDEN. I believe it would be proper for the Forest Service to do that. There are not only some differences in situations, but I believe the Forest Service is fully aware of where the money can be best used at this time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should not want the record to go unchallenged too far in that regard, because that was not primarily what the committee had in

mind in connection with Operation 66 and Operation Outdoors. We were essentially interested in deriving the greatest conservation value for the dollar. Everything else being equal, I would say the situation described by the Senator from Oregon might come into the picture. However, this is not a boondoggle operation. This is not an antidepression measure. This matter can stand on its own bottom in all time to come from the standpoint of advancing the conservation resources of the country and the improvement of the great outdoors recreation areas, whether in periods of depression or prosperity. The project is not to be considered as a depression relief measure, or anything like that.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has exactly expressed the attitude of the committee in that regard.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is my attitude also. I became interested in Project 66 and Project Outdoors even before I became a Member of the Senate, and before the names describing the projects came into existence.

Mr. MUNDT. I began advocating such projects even before I heard of Operation 66 and Operation Outdoors.

Mr. NEUBERGER. My question to the chairman specifically referred to two areas of equal recreational importance.

I recognize that the primary purpose of the fund is to improve national parks and national forests, for the benefit of people who wish to camp and hunt and fish and hike, and do all the other things which can be done in the great outdoors and in the wilderness. My question specifically referred to two projects of equal recreational importance.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not wish to have any misunderstandings; with reference specifically to recreation, the committee stood mute. We were interested primarily in conservation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Undoubtedly the Forest Service could take that factor into consideration.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is what I thought the answer of the chairman of the committee would be, and it is the only answer that could properly be given to my question. There are undoubtedly areas of equal recreational importance, one being an area where there might be a vast labor surplus force, in which a great many people could be put to work in improving trails and campsites, and so forth.

The greatest program ever undertaken in the national forests, according to the chief of the Forest Service, particularly with respect to recreation, was the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 1930's. It was begun primarily to get jobless boys off the streets of our great cities. However, it resulted in the greatest expansion that has ever occurred in outdoor activities, particularly in the Western States. Therefore, that factor has not been disregarded. That is a part of the history of our country during the past quarter century. I believe the RECORD should show that.

Mr. MUNDT. The RECORD should also show that there is not the remotest relationship between the CCC program and the determination of our committee

to advance, as far as and as fast as we can, in the direction of sound national conservation at this time.

We did not construe the proposal, and I will not construe it, whether we may have more prosperity or less prosperity, as primarily an economic measure. This is something the country needs, and needs badly, at any time. I would not wish the record even remotely to indicate that our judgment in this connection was influenced because we expected to do more conservation work in depressed areas, and less in areas which were not depressed. I say that because I doubt whether even a Solomon, if he could be reincarnated, and were made the Chief of the Park Service or Forest Service, could find two situations where things were completely equal. If it were possible to reincarnate Solomon, and he could find such equal situations, then I would agree it would be wise for him to spend the money first in the area which was depressed. However, I do not believe that we can produce a Solomon, in or out of Government.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am pleased, at least, that the Senator from South Dakota should offer such a suggestion, provided we could reincarnate Solomon. I would remind the Senator that he has been placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of late, editorials and speeches on the subject of how prosperous South Dakota is. I, along with my distinguished senior colleague, represent the State of Oregon which unfortunately, for the past 4½ years has had, winter after winter, virtually the highest unemployment rate in the Nation.

Therefore, we may have a slightly different perspective on what it means when there are thousands of people in a State out of work, who have exhausted their unemployment benefits, and do not know where they can get any more work, or where they can get any shelter for their families. Therefore, we might have a different idea of what joblessness means.

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy that South Dakota should enjoy a period of prosperity.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy also for South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I regret that the State of Oregon is not so fortunate at the present time. However, I wish the RECORD clearly to show that, despite the prosperity in the State of South Dakota and the temporary unhappy situation in the State of Oregon, the program we are discussing is nationwide. It is a conservation program. It is no part of a leaf-raking or CCC program, and has nothing to do with an anti-depression program. I hope that next year both Oregon and South Dakota will be equally prosperous.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We share that hope.

Mr. MUNDT. And we hope that Congress will continue to expand the conservation program.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have several other questions which I should like to ask of the distinguished chairman of the committee. I note that the bill contains an item of \$3,750,000, which has been

added for structural improvements, including housing, to make a total of \$12,360,000. Is it the opinion of the chairman that some of this additional money can be used for new housing, as well as for lookout towers, warehouses, and other such facilities?

Mr. HAYDEN. The testimony before our committee demonstrated that it was highly essential in many places that the dilapidated living quarters be replaced by adequate housing. We cannot expect a young man who has completed his course in a forestry school and has qualified for a position of this kind, particularly a young married man, to go into the forest and live like a trapper. On the other hand, the quarters provided for are not expensive. They can be built reasonably, and it was the intention of the committee to include them, of course. As you know, the employees pay rent for the use of these houses.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator. The regional officials of the Forest Service in the Pacific Northwest have told me that outstanding graduates of schools of forestry have been discouraged from joining the Forest Service because such shabby housing facilities have been provided for them in the past.

Last Monday, April 28, I introduced, in cooperation with other Senators, a bill to expand forest research in cooperation with forestry colleges. Is it the opinion of the chairman that the Secretary of Agriculture could utilize some of the forest research money to enter into cooperative agreements with colleges of forestry in certain instances?

Mr. HAYDEN. There has been no testimony before our committee to that effect. I should not like to pass judgment on it without knowing more about it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That subject has not been testified to before the committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask the chairman several questions about the appropriations for forest access roads and trails, which are so important to the harvesting of the full allowable cut of national forest timber in the States where the forests are located. As a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, I was closely associated with the action which provided an increased authorization for 1959-60. Am I correct in understanding that the \$27 million in cash recommended by the Committee on Appropriations will allow \$34,664,000 worth of projects to be undertaken in fiscal year 1959 on forest roads?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator's figures are correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Am I also correct in assuming that the committee is not limiting the Forest Service in any way, and should it appear to be good business, the Forest Service can utilize during fiscal year 1959 part of the access-road money authorized for 1960, as provided by law?

Mr. HAYDEN. The law provides for it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am sure the chairman appreciates the fact that in order to provide the fully allowable timber cut, we must set up a road-con-

struction program. Would it be the chairman's view, if the economic situation indicated it to be feasible, that we could move into the 1960 program during the next fiscal year?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not know enough about the facts to answer that question definitely. However, the Forest Service does exercise good judgment as to what should be done in that respect. What has happened in the past is that the Department of Agriculture has never taken advantage of the contract authority it has under the Federal-Aid Highway Acts. When the Secretary of Agriculture was before our committee, he assured us that the Department would take advantage of the law and would do it immediately with respect to money made immediately available in the Highway Act that was just passed by the Congress. The Department of Agriculture is going to use its contract authority immediately. I think it will be a fine thing for the Department of Agriculture to, as the other departments do, utilize its contract authority, and not wait until they have the cash in hand before going to work.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator for his very helpful answers. I doubt if any program is more important to the Pacific Northwest than the program for access roads, which enable the harvesting of our national forest timber on a competitive basis which is fair to all operators, sawmills, and lumber companies.

I reiterate what I said earlier. I doubt that any other bill has been brought before the Senate in modern times which provides for such generous and wise conservation and development of our natural resources, as does the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a few questions concerning the bill for the purpose of making a legislative history. When I have finished asking the questions, I shall offer an amendment which does not call for any additional funds, and which I hope, after I have explained it, the chairman will see fit to take to conference, to see if in conference it will prove to be as meritorious as I think it is.

Before I ask the questions and explain the purpose of the amendment, I commend the Committee on Appropriations and its very able chairman for the real and significant increases which have been made over and above the Eisenhower budget. I say, with no flattery on my lips, that the leadership and statesmanship of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] in the field of Senate appropriations both humble and inspire me. I am certain that no one in the history of the Senate has made a more brilliant record in being exceedingly fair, impartial, and judicious in handling the appropriation problems of Members of the Senate and the States which they represent than has the Senator from Arizona. We have but an-

other example of that statesmanship in the form of the bill being considered this afternoon.

Congress has shown its awareness not only of the problem posed by the recession, but also of the need to preserve our natural resources and to develop them for the future.

I am particularly pleased because many of the increases which have been allowed in the bill are in line with the suggestions and recommendations of the two Senators from Oregon and with the recommendations shared by our colleagues in Congress.

I shall first discuss the Bureau of Land Management budget. A \$2 million increase has been allowed by the committee. Funds which were transferred from certain activities for Alaska firefighting have been restored, and operations have been stepped up. Increases have been made in the construction program in the Bureau of Land Management budget which are vitally needed.

The Park Service budget and Mission 66 have received most careful consideration. Funds for improvement and protection have been restored by the Senate committee. Funds for the maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities have been increased above the budget estimate. These are vitally needed funds which will take care of expanded park use. The administration made a \$5 million cut in the Mission 66 construction program. The Senate committee has not only restored the program to its previous level, but has increased it, from the administration's request of \$12.4 million, to \$24 million. The committee has provided the Senate with a detailed list of the projects typical of those which can be speeded up. It fully justified putting Mission 66 on an expanded basis rather than cutting it back. The committee has also authorized that the road and trail and parkway program go forward at fully authorized amounts.

The committee's action on the Forest Service has been most fair and understanding. Each and every program with which many of us have long been associated, has received fair consideration. The vital reforestation program has been increased by \$1.5 million. Operation Out-Doors, which the administration cut back, has been placed back on schedule. Funds have been added for structural improvements, such as housing, lookouts, and warehouses. Insect and disease control and soil and water management have been accelerated. The committee has allowed \$4,600,000 increase for forest research; \$2,100,000 will go to strengthen research programs, and the balance will be spent for the construction of urgently needed facilities. While not one of these new facilities will be in Oregon, the results of the research that will be performed will benefit Oregon and every other State in the Union.

The committee has restored the cut which the administration proposed in the Clarke-McNary Act. We have 52 million acres in need of reforestation, and the administration proposed an 80-percent reduction in this program. The committee acted not only with wisdom, but with restraint.

I am particularly pleased by the committee action on forest roads and trails.

I had asked that this program be brought up to the full authorization, and the committee has done this. The result of getting this program up to par will be to the benefit of not only the national forests but also every person in the Nation who is in the market for a house. This one increase alone will do a tremendous amount to help put the national forests on a full production basis.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that this appropriation bill represents the attitude of our distinguished majority leader, who has determined that he will not sit by and wring his hands or make cheerful statements about the condition of our economy. This is a budget which is responsive to needs that exist. It is a budget which will put people to work now. It is a budget which will develop the Nation for the long-term growth of our economy.

At this point, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee for some information. Some of the people in my State have suggested to me that it would be vital to increase the funds available for timber sales administration and management with the expectation that there would be an increase in the salability of national forest timber. The committee is aware, of course, that these requests did not come until a few days ago. Therefore, I shall ask the chairman if he would entertain a supplemental appropriation later in the fiscal year if it should be determined that the Forest Service could sell substantially more timber than can be processed with the funds allocated under the budget now before the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think that would be fair and proper, if the facts are as the Senator has stated them, and they are corroborated by the Forest Service.

Mr. MORSE. I should want to have the facts established before the Senator's committee.

Would that also be the Senator's position with respect to the Bureau of Land Management budget?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. If a supplemental appropriation bill were to be considered by the Senate, and the facts justified such action as the Senator from Oregon is proposing, we would, of course, do what he requests. It would depend on what the facts were at that time.

Mr. MORSE. The burden of proof would be upon the two agencies concerned to present facts justifying the appropriation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I feel impelled to reiterate, in part, the colloquy I had last year with the Senator from Arizona, so that the new Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of Agriculture can study the legislative history and be guided by it.

Last year, after Congress passed the appropriation bill, the Department of Agriculture impounded \$1 million of the timber-access road money. Then the Department dribbled out the money with political announcements as though the administration had manufactured the money; as though Oregon's delegation in Congress were nonexistent, the notification being made first in the State to

candidates for office, and subsequently to the Oregon delegation. But we are used to that, and I am good humored about it.

While, on the one hand, the myth of more money was being perpetrated, the President's budget requested only \$23,099,000 for roads for 1959, while the previous year's budget had been \$24,336,000.

I point out also that while the construction of timber access roads with appropriated funds was being cut back, the construction of such roads by timber purchasers had increased. That means the Federal timber was sold to the purchaser, but at a price which permitted him to build his own roads.

The timber purchaser construction method puts a drain on Treasury receipts. In 1956, \$23.4 million of receipts were drained off by this method while in 1958 the drain has increased to \$32.7 million. I say this with some feeling because of the \$9.3 million increased drain, \$7.4 million occurred in Oregon and Washington. Our counties are losing \$1.8 million more than heretofore due to the heavy reliance of this administration on timber purchaser road construction.

Oregon and Washington have suffered substantial unemployment; yet the administration budget proposed less money for access roads; and, under its program, it was also proposed to cut more heavily into funds properly due the counties which are struggling with this recession at the grassroots. These policies have also further strangled the small and medium size timber operators.

I should like, at this point, to ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee some questions about the road and trail program:

Is it the position of the chairman of the committee that the full amount of the authorization for forest roads should be used?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is highly advantageous to the Forest Service and also to the Treasury of the United States to handle the matter in that way.

Mr. MORSE. Is it also the view of the chairman of the committee that these funds should not be impounded while the Department permits timber purchasers to proceed to build roads, thereby draining off receipts?

Mr. HAYDEN. I oppose very much the impounding of the funds appropriated by Congress, without letting Congress know about it. However, there is not a provision of law requiring the Bureau of the Budget to notify the Congress when funds are placed in reserve or impounded. I think there should be such a law.

Mr. MORSE. I do not intend to digress into a discussion of that matter, which may come up in connection with legislation to be proposed later. But does the chairman of the committee disagree with me when I point out that, in effect, this impounding practice has become a form of an individual item veto in the case of an appropriation bill, at least to the extent that it succeeds in delaying—probably until another fiscal year—the expenditure of an appropriation which

the Congress in its wisdom has said should be spent?

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course, it is true that the President and all other executive officers take an oath to see that the laws are duly executed. But they exercise their judgment with respect to them. I found out long ago, when I first came to the Congress, that it is impossible to make any department spend any money that has been appropriated, unless the department wishes to do so. It is lawful, but I question the policy.

Mr. MORSE. I do not question the lawfulness; but I, too, question it as a public policy.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. So that the record will not indicate that the impounding of public moneys, in connection with appropriations, is a Republican invention, I should like to call attention to the fact that it was practiced by President Truman and by preceding Presidents, and is something with which the Congress has wrestled for a long time.

Mr. MORSE. And I am sure the Senator will recall that at the time when I sat on his side of the aisle, I, too, criticized President Truman for that practice. I do not think it is a proper practice, regardless of what President may exercise it.

Although the President has a right so to act, it seems to me that when the Congress has appropriated funds to be used for construction of public-access roads, there should be a very good reason why the execution of the judgment of the Congress should be postponed. But we do not get notice of the reason; we only receive notice that the funds have been impounded.

That is why I am trying now to write this legislative history today, through the distinguished Senator from Arizona, because I think it will have great weight with any administration—Republican or Democratic—after we show what the Senator from Arizona thinks about a matter such as this.

Let me say to my friend, the Senator from South Dakota—as he has already noted—that I am not opposed to the road contract approach entirely. I think there are particular instances in which it is wise economy to proceed in that way. But we have been faced with a cutback in the Federal construction of access roads into the Federal timber—and such roads would benefit the small mill operators in my State—and an increase in the timber purchaser road-construction program, which many of us feel gives undue benefit to the large timber operator who has sufficient money to be able to purchase a large tract of land and to get the stumpage cost knocked down to such an extent that he can build the road himself. But the little fellow does not have that kind of money, and has to rely upon the federally constructed road.

That is why I am pleased that all the members of the committee this year did

so magnificent a job in recognition of the need for some federally built access roads, to the tune of the increase for which the committee voted.

Would it be the view of the Senator from Arizona that if there were to be a cutback in the road program, it should be done by reducing timber purchaser road construction, rather than Federal access-road construction?

Mr. HAYDEN. Obviously, it would be best for the Treasury of the United States to proceed in that way.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Arizona agree with me that an accelerated road program using appropriated funds and contract authority can be a very useful economic weapon in the fight against recession?

Mr. HAYDEN. There can be no question about that.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the opinion of the chairman of the committee that if the recession problems continue, or if there is an increase in the demand for timber, it is desirable to speed up the construction by utilizing the advance contract authority contained in the Highway Act?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it should be used almost exclusively by the Department of Agriculture just as it is by the Department of the Interior in connection with building Indian reservation roads and National Park Service roads. It is entirely proper to take advantage of the contract authority and to let the contracts and to get the work done.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator from Arizona has pointed out in correspondence with me, that is exactly what he suggested to the Secretary of Agriculture when the Secretary was before his committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. If the Department elected to use advance contract authority, would the Senator from Arizona be agreeable to considering a supplemental appropriation, if requested by the Department?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think that, by and large, we can handle this matter in the proper way. We probably shall have enough money at the moment. If facts develop to show that more money is needed, I would be in favor of providing it. In other words, we have to judge each instance by the conditions which exist at the time.

Mr. MORSE. Now I shall move to a brief discussion of the purpose of the amendment I like to offer. Before doing so, or before I explain it, in order that the RECORD may be clear, let me ask this question: It is true, is it not, that under the arrangement the Federal Government has with the Oregon O. and C. counties, in the O. and C. timber areas, the counties may spend for the construction of roads up to 25 percent of the receipts they get in lieu of taxes, for Federal timber?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. That is true, is it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. It is my understanding that the counties have been well satisfied with that procedure.

Mr. MORSE. The counties are well satisfied with it; in fact, I hold in my hand a news statement from the Salem Statesman, of Salem, Oreg., of April 15, 1958, in which Mr. Frank Sever, the at-

torney for the O. and C. counties, is quoted as saying that "the counties generally have indicated that they want to spend no more than the present 25 percent of timber receipts for access roads and other improvements."

But the county officials have made clear to me and to my office that they want to be free to spend up to 25 percent, if the funds are made available.

That brings me to a question which I wish to present to the Senator from Arizona. I had hoped to have a chance to talk to him before I brought up the matter on the floor of the Senate. But I have been so involved today that this is the first opportunity I have had to present it to him.

My purpose is to assure that the full 25 percent of the receipts which the counties have earmarked for roads and reforestation will be available if the counties so desire and if a later estimate of the receipts indicates that that can be done.

The present indications are that revenue sufficient to handle a \$6 million program of reforestation and road construction will be forthcoming in the fiscal year 1959. That is the present estimate, I understand—namely, \$6 million.

However, the program level will be approximately \$500,000 below that amount. In other words, although the estimate will be approximately \$6 million, the program level is now fixed at about \$500,000 below that amount.

This provision is not mandatory, and would become operative only after the Secretary consulted with local O. and C. officials. The amendment which I shall offer will help avert a substantial drop in the O. and C. program, and is very important, since the Bureau of Land Management has just announced that, in order to complete its 12,000 miles of network, another 6,300 miles of access roads will be needed.

My amendment will not add one more penny of appropriation to this bill. It is consistent with the O. and C. counties' position that up to 25 percent of their share of receipts should be used for roads and reforestation; but they usually know 60 to 90 days before the end of the year about what the total receipts will be, and it will put them in such a position, in the last quarter of the fiscal year, that if they see that the receipts are going to be greater than they originally estimated, they can proceed to contract for the building of additional roads and contract for reforestation, up to the 25 percent; no more.

Let me restate my question: What my proposal, in effect, makes it clear to the O. and C. counties that if the actual income or receipts will be greater than is contemplated under the present road-building and reforestation schedule, they can proceed to contract up to the 25 percent of what they believe the total receipts will be.

I would word an amendment as follows:

On page 5, line 6, after "provided further," insert the following: "That if the Secretary of the Interior finds that the amount to be credited to the general fund of the Treasury for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, under the provisions of the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the act of Au-

gust 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876) will be greater than the amount appropriated herein, such amount appropriated shall be increased to equal such amount accredited, if the county officials of the counties entitled to benefits under such second paragraph agree to such increase."

We leave it entirely to the counties. As I have indicated, the counties are bound by the 25-percent figure, but this proposal at least would give them an opportunity, when they see they are to get more money than they thought they would, to speed up their program in the last quarter, because they need the additional 6,300 miles of road beyond the mileage contemplated by the program.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am afraid the Senator has two strikes against the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. The advice of the Senator from Arizona will have great effect on me. I have not offered an amendment yet. I should like to have the Senator's views on it.

Mr. HAYDEN. My understanding is that the rules of the Senate forbid an appropriation based upon a contingency. This proposal is an "if". That is the first reason for not adopting the amendment. Secondly, it is always very much better to have a budget estimate or a recommendation from a department in advance of making an appropriation.

If the situation arises which the Senator says may arise, and if there is a need to do what he wants done, and that matter is brought to the attention of the Bureau of Land Management the matter can be presented in the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill by the committee. We can take testimony to determine if an additional appropriation is justified.

Mr. MORSE. I am completely satisfied by the Senator's explanation. I accept his judgment in regard to the matter. I shall not offer the proposal as an amendment. That is why I followed this procedure. If I had had an opportunity to talk to the Senator beforehand, I would not have taken as much time as I have. I did not have a chance to speak to the Senator. However, we have made a record which will be available to all concerned.

Mr. HAYDEN. I assure the Senator that if there is any change that justifies doing what he has suggested, and the facts develop that to be the case, there will be other opportunities to carry out the proposal.

Mr. MORSE. I close by saying again I thank the Senator from Arizona for what I consider to be a most statesmanlike job he and his committee have done in presenting the report. On behalf of the people of my State, I repeat, and I know I speak the views of my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER], as he indicated, I thank the chairman and the committee for the fairness with which they have treated the forest problems of my State.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I know how fair the Senator has been in response to questions asked by Senators. I shall be brief. There are three matters which affect my State about which I should like to ask the Senator. In Lyon and Trigg

Counties, in southwestern Kentucky, much of which will be inundated by the lake behind Barkley Dam on the lower Cumberland, a great many citizens are disturbed about plans of the Department of the Interior to acquire additional large tracts of land for a game and wildlife refuge.

Last year I asked the Senator this same question. Are there any funds in the bill which will enable the Department to acquire such land?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, there are no such funds provided. Congress is about to provide by law for an increase in the price of duck stamps. The resulting additional money is to be devoted exclusively to the acquisition of lands for wildlife refuges. That is a source of funds into which the Senator from Kentucky can look, and probably he will find some of those funds can be utilized for the purpose he has in mind.

Mr. COOPER. I may say to the Senator I myself am opposed to the acquisition of additional large tracts of land for the refuge. Much of the lands in that area will be taken in any event by Barkley Lake.

Can I be assured that there is no money provided in the bill to pay for the acquisition of such lands?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, there is no appropriation for that purpose, and the only money made available for that purpose will come from increased funds as a result of the sale of duck stamps.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The proposed duck-stamp legislation has not yet completed its passage through Congress. I think it should be enacted into law. I think the wildlife refuges are very important. If the Senator from Kentucky has a particular area in his State in which he thinks it will be against the public interest to locate such a refuge, he can still be in favor of the duck-stamp bill. He should lodge his protest with the Fish and Wildlife Service and point out to it that the area to which he has reference is not the place to locate a refuge. If he succeeds, I will say to him that we in South Dakota will be glad to have one.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. The question is whether the Kentucky Woodlands National Wildlife Refuge should be or should not be increased in size. I believe most of the people do not believe its size should be increased.

Mr. MUNDT. Nothing our committee has done will disturb the status quo in any way.

Mr. COOPER. I should now like to ask about the appropriation relating to the development of the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, which lies in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia, and which is an area through which 300,000 of the earliest settlers of the West passed from the eastern seaboard.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the tabulation which appears in the committee report shows a recommended increase in the amount of \$268,000 for that item.

Mr. COOPER. That is under Mission 66.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I understand in that part of the appropriation which obligates funds for roads and trails, there is included \$425,000 for the grade separation at U. S. 25E, and for access roads.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a part of the program submitted by the Bureau of the Budget. It is in the approved budget program.

Mr. COOPER. I have been informed that is correct. That has been approved.

One other question, and then I shall desist.

In 1954, a forest research center was established at Berea College, Kentucky. I think it has been quite successful in its land management and timber management aspects, and also in timber utilization. I asked the committee to appropriate additional funds for the project. I understand the budget request was approved at \$50,275, and that an additional \$30,000 was added to those funds for the Berea College center.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has been correctly informed.

Mr. COOPER. I want to thank the distinguished Senator and join with others in expressing my own appreciation of the Senator's fairness and thoughtfulness in all these matters.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I rise to commend the Appropriations Committee for its action on the Interior appropriations bill and to announce that I plan to support the recommended increases reported by the committee.

The appropriation of \$489 million, recommended in this measure, represents an increase of only \$29 million over the appropriations for the past fiscal year. And in view of the fact that this bill carries funds for administration, development, and protection of the public lands and resources of the United States and its possessions, this represents a very modest increase for a program which affects virtually every man, woman, and child in this country, and embraces a land acreage totaling 455 million acres in the 48 States and another 300 million acres in the Territories.

The Appropriations Committee report explained and justified the \$76 million increase which the Senate committee made above the levels recommended in the House bill. I shall not cover the same ground, but I wish to comment briefly on some increases that affect my State directly.

The item for management of lands and resources carries an increase of \$2 million above the House figure. Actually, this is only an increase of \$1 million, inasmuch as \$1 million will go to make up funds diverted from the entire management program for fire fighting, essentially in Alaska, during the current fiscal year.

The combined restoration and increases, however, represent a total increase for essential management areas of \$230,000 for lease and disposal of land and mineral resources; \$100,000 for management of grazing lands; \$350,000 for forestry management of BLM lands; \$120,000 for cadastral surveys, a very important item for my State; \$550,000 for the important area of soil and moisture conservation; and \$650,000 for weed control.

Anyone familiar with the problem of managing the 468 million acres of BLM lands in 26 States and Alaska needs no explanation of the importance of these programs, which traditionally have been conducted on an austerity basis.

An editorial in the Salt Lake Tribune of August 21, 1957, dealt with the problem of reseeding burned-over rangelands on the public domain, and in view of its applicability to the present consideration of the bill, I hereby request unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, along with a letter of October 18, 1957, from BLM Director Woolley, giving his views on the recommendations in the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEED THE BURNED LANDS

Many thousands of acres of rangeland have been burned over this hot and dry summer throughout the Intermountain West.

Blackened areas which had been covered with dry, low-type grass and brush extend as far as the eye can see in a shocking number of sections, particularly in south-central Idaho, where towns, farms and other valuable property have been damaged or endangered by racing flames.

Much of the land is publicly owned, a great deal of it administered by the Federal Bureau of Land Management. Many years of unregulated or inadequately controlled grazing, plus some deliberate and unwise burning, have removed the desirable forage and only form of plant life, largely cheatgrass, remains. This is highly flammable when mature and a poor range cover.

After the land has been burned over conditions are good for reseeding the land into desirable grasses which are not only more palatable for livestock but put down deeper roots and serve as a better protective cover for the soil. These grasses, particularly the wheat grasses, remain green longer even in drought conditions and therefore do not burn at every drop of a match or cigarette.

The Bureau of Land Management has re-seeding programs under way but the job of rehabilitating some 150 million acres of Federal range is incredibly large. Funds should be available to reseed the burned over rangelands so that beneficial grasses will sprout as soon as moisture falls. Cooperative programs should be ready to go, particularly in acute problem areas.

A Bureau of Land Management report says about 50 percent of Federal rangelands are in a state of severe to critical erosion and 32 percent are eroding moderately. This is gross waste—destruction of topsoil. Cheatgrass should be replaced with desirable plants.

UNITED STATES

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,

Washington, D. C., October 18, 1957.

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: The editorial from the August 21 issue of the Salt Lake City Tribune on burned-over lands in Utah and Idaho that you recently sent to me with your letter of October 9, has been reviewed with a great deal of interest. Thank you for calling our attention to the publicity given to the problem of range fires in those two States, and requesting my comments on the availability of funds for use in reseeding burned-over rangelands and about program planning to remedy the adverse conditions created by range fires.

The Bureau of Land Management has not requested appropriations specifically for the purpose of revegetating public lands denuded

by fire. However, funds are available in the soil and moisture and weed-control programs which may be utilized for this purpose whenever the burned-over lands are of such character and so located as to make such operations feasible. Very often areas covered by fire are too rough to permit the use of ground-seeding equipment and sometimes are located in belts of low precipitation where successful reseeding is questionable.

Usually our soil and moisture conservation fund has been used to complete emergency seeding operations on burned-over areas. However, where halogeton is prevalent the halogeton control fund is likewise available to the extent that it can be diverted from previously planned work. Whenever either of these funds is used in this way, projects that were planned in justifying the appropriation have to be postponed and re-planned.

The availability of funds specifically for the purpose of the emergency revegetation would prove very helpful to the Bureau's operations. Planned programs would not then be interfered with and there would exist a better possibility that needed vegetative rehabilitation practices would be completed on burned-over areas. The likelihood exists that every burn should be seeded with the best adapted forage species available. If such seeding could not be done with ground-planting equipment, which would be most desirable, then it may be done by aerial broadcasting. This seeding should follow the burn as promptly as proper seasonal conditions will permit.

Each year the Bureau prepares program plans providing for the amount of range-land reseeding, along with other conservation and improvement works, which anticipated appropriations will permit. These reseeding projects are always planned with specific tracts of land in mind and therefore do not provide for subsequently burned areas.

The current year is the third of a 20-year departmental conservation program that was devised and approved on an accelerating basis whereby all depleted public lands under Interior Department jurisdiction were to receive appropriate treatment by the end of that period. It is hoped that this program may ultimately be completed as originally planned, but it has become necessary to curtail the work to some degree during the current fiscal year to absorb unprecedented fire suppression costs. This cutback will not only delay planned conservation accomplishment but will also present less latitude in diverting funds to handle needed reseeding of burned areas.

I hope that the above comments have given you a sufficient idea of the Bureau's methods of handling and financing emergency reseeding operations on burned-over rangelands. If you have any further questions concerning the program of the Bureau in this or any other matter I would be glad to answer them for you.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD WOOLEY, Director.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, 2 of the largest increases in this bill were made to expedite 2 major recreational resource improvement programs that have attracted nationwide interest and support. These programs are the Mission 66 program of the National Park Service, and the Operation Outdoors program of the Forest Service. These programs are of special interest to the West, because of our relatively large forest and park acreage. However, these two programs will improve public recreation areas and reserved acreage throughout the 48 States and our Territories.

Improvements made under this program also will contribute to the anti-recession program, because they involve essentially small construction jobs which can be undertaken this year. However, this factor is incidental to the long-range, overall importance of these two programs to outdoor public recreation and resource management.

The \$11.6 million increase for the construction program of the Park Service makes possible an improvement program totaling \$1,887,700 for Utah National Parks and Monuments and nearby Grand Canyon National Park. I have summarized the Senate-recommended increases in funds for visitor facilities at these internationally known national park units as follows:

Name of park or monument	Senate-recommended increase	Total available under Senate bill
Arches National Monument	\$218,400	\$218,400
Cedar Breaks National Monument	99,600	111,600
Dinosaur National Monument	75,800	132,500
Grand Canyon National Park (Arizona)	167,500	888,500
Zion National Park		539,700
Total	561,300	1,887,700

Comparable figures were not provided in the report for the details of the \$3 million increase recommended in the Operation Outdoors program of the Forest Service. However, I recently received a report from the regional forester on the program pursued in Utah during the current fiscal year, and I hereby request unanimous consent to have this report printed in the RECORD at this point in these remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Ogden, Utah, April 4, 1958.
Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate.

DEAR ARTHUR: In answer to your inquiry of Secretary Benson's Office, we have been re-

quested to send you a followup report on Operation Outdoors for the national forests in Utah.

With our letter of September 23, 1957, we sent you a tabulation of the rehabilitation and construction work we hoped to accomplish during the current fiscal year. On the attached sheet we have shown the planned work as well as the accomplishments we expect to attain by June 30. The final column sets forth the allotments to Utah forest supervisors for this work.

Our primary effort during the first year of Operation Outdoors has been directed toward placing wornout camp and picnic grounds in satisfactory condition. We have also intensified cleanup services at the 260 camp and picnic grounds within Utah national forests. Special attention has been given to the maintenance of sanitary facilities in those recreation areas situated in watersheds which provide culinary water for nearby communities.

Some of the larger areas where construction and rehabilitation work is being accomplished are as follows:

Ashley National Forest: Moon Lake campground, north of Altonah; Browne Lake campground, south of Manila.

Cache National Forest: Picnic areas in Logan Canyon.

Dixie National Forest: Navajo Lake campground, Duck Creek campground.

Fishlake National Forest: Ponderosa campground, east of Beaver.

Manti-LaSal National Forest: Oowah campground, southeast of Moab; Dolten Springs campground, east of Monticello.

Uinta National Forest: Little Mill campground, American Fork Canyon; Bear Canyon campground, southeast of Santaquin.

Wasatch National Forest: China Meadows picnic ground, near China Lake; Storm Mountain picnic ground, Big Cottonwood Canyon.

The increase in public use of Utah national forests has exceeded our expectations. In 1957 there were 4.6 million visits—an increase of 12 percent over the previous year.

We will be glad to send you our plans for continuing the Operation Outdoors program the coming fiscal year soon after we are advised as to the amount of funds which will be available.

Please let us know if you have any questions or desire additional information.

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD IVERSON,
Regional Forester.

Program for operation outdoors—Utah, fiscal year 1958

Forest	Work planned			Expected accomplishment by June 30, 1958			
	New construction units ¹	Rehabilitation		New construction units ¹	Rehabilitation		Funds allocated ²
		Units ¹	Water systems		Units ¹	Water systems	
Ashley	34			24			\$28,498
Cache	29	107	3	15		2	81,862
Dixie	16	137		36	59		24,735
Fishlake	6	40			69		34,219
Manti-LaSal	28			49	3		30,991
Uinta	20	36	2	8	110	2	80,826
Wasatch	194	59	1	73	518		134,092
Total	327	379	6	205	759	4	415,223

¹ A unit consists of a table, stove, and necessary facilities to accommodate a family group of 5.

² These figures represent allocations for on-the-ground project work. They do not include the cost of providing engineering or recreation landscape architect services provided the forests by the regional office or a proportionate share of supervision and planning costs at the national forest, regional and Washington office levels.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the description of the activities undertaken during the first year of this program in one State should indicate the widespread public benefits which are starting to accrue from this program to re-

store the hitherto neglected public recreation facilities on our national forest lands.

Other Senate-recommended increases in Forest Service funds, totaling \$10 million, also appear to be eminently jus-

tified. The entire Forest Service program, I might add, is one of the few Government activities which has annual receipts approximating its expenditures. Many of the other appropriations in this budget also are offset to some degree by fees and other revenues. This, overall, is a revenue-producing budget and the participating agencies have been traditionally well managed and conservative. In the affirmation of this, I hereby request unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, an editorial from the Ogden Standard-Examiner of April 20, 1958, commenting favorably on the Mission 66 program of the National Parks Service. Similar comments could be made—and have been made by this and other area editorial writers—on the Forest Service program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NATIONAL PARKS PLEA

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat of Montana, told the Senate last week that the Interior Department has failed to ask for sufficient funds to develop facilities in the national parks in accordance with the Mission 66 program. This is the time to improve our parks, the Montanan said, not only to provide better accommodations for the millions of visitors, but to add permanent improvements to the parks and provide needed jobs. In support of larger appropriations, Senator MURRAY quoted Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat of Virginia, a watchdog of the Treasury, as declaring he had never discovered in a National Park Service budget a request for nonessential item and the Service gets \$1.20 of value out of each dollar voted.

Praise from Senator BYRD is praise indeed and the quotations should help Senator MURRAY obtain increased funds for the parks.

Millions of Americans know from visits to the parks that more facilities are required to accommodate the increasing numbers eager to enjoy the parks. Every Senator and Representative surely knows that development is lagging. They should know this from studying the Mission 66 program for a 10-year project to bring the parks up to standards, so that by 1966 they will be able to serve the 80 million visitors it is estimated will be crowding the parks in that year.

Every informed American doubtless agrees with Senator MURRAY that this assuredly is no year to economize on our national parks and monuments.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in closing, I also wish to commend the committee for providing an increase of \$2,421,350 for construction of fish and wildlife facilities. This action permits an appropriation of \$225,000 to complete construction of long-needed new facilities at the Springville, Utah, fish hatchery, which supplies game fish for planting in streams in Utah and adjoining areas. This is a most commendable project, and I feel sure that the other facilities covered in this appropriation increase warrant expedited construction.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to H. R. 10746.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 24, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,-

616,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$11,916,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the amendment would, under the item of "Management and investigations of resources," under the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, increase the appropriation from \$11,616,000 to \$11,916,000. The increase is \$300,000, which is sought for the purpose of research into the effects of poisonous pesticides on wildlife, as well as on domestic animals, and on human life.

Each year insect pests, plant diseases, and weeds take a toll estimated at \$11 billion from our economy. To combat this tremendous loss, some \$2 billion is spent each year on control measures, mostly for pesticidal chemicals and their application. More than 750 million pounds of pesticides, having a value of \$250 million, are now produced in the United States each year. About two-thirds of this production is for domestic utilization on about 100 million acres of the Nation's lands and waters.

Although there has been an enormous increase in the use of pesticides during the last 15 years, the industry estimates that it is supplying only one-sixth of the present need, so the outlook is for a vast and continued expansion of production of these poisons and their use on the lands, waters, plants, and food of America.

Effective control of pests is recognized as an essential part of our modern agriculture and public health programs. Oftentimes, however, the materials as applied cause direct or indirect damage to wildlife, fish, and domestic animals. Experience has shown that much of this loss is unnecessary and could be prevented or minimized by careful regulation of the rates, seasons, and methods of applying the control agents. Effective progress has been made in this direction as a result of intensive studies of several of the chemicals, such as DDT, which are in common use.

New formulations are appearing daily and there are now some 220 control agents available in the market. Two hundred and twenty different poisons are being sold in the American market. The present level of research is inadequate to screen these materials and learn their immediate and long-term effects on fish and wildlife. An expanded twofold program is needed to cope with the problem: Determinations of acute and chronic toxicity levels and effects on reproductive capacity of the various pesticides through studies of penned animals and on controlled sample plots; field appraisal of wide-scale operations such as those for fire ant, gypsy moth, spruce budworms, grasshopper, and Mormon cricket control, to determine their effects on fish and wildlife and to develop measures for reducing damage through changes in materials, rates, methods, and times of treatment.

For the purposes described, it is recommended that the sum of \$240,000 be added to subactivity (b) of item 6 for wildlife research and the sum of \$60,000

be added to item 3 for fishery research—fishery management research—under Management and Investigations of Resources, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

Incidentally, this amendment has the support of the National Wildlife Federation and the Wildlife Management Institute, both of which are pleading for this small \$300,000 appropriation so that research can begin in this field to determine what the poisons are doing, not merely to the reproductive processes of fish and wildlife, but also of all animal life, as well as human life.

Mr. C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, with headquarters in Washington, D. C., testified before the committee as follows, as shown on page 591 of the hearings:

We think that it is being very, very conservative to ask for a meager \$300,000 to start some real, honest-to-goodness studies on the effects of these powerful chemical controls. If the Congress sees fit, based on the meager amount of research that has been done on some of these chemicals which we point out here are 20 times more toxic than DDT, then certainly we ought to get some research going on this important thing.

Public concern is mounting over the effect of these economic poisons on fish and game and other beneficial insect and animal life, as well as on humans and livestock. The time to prevent losses is before new super-poisons go into commercial use. Each must be tested thoroughly in the laboratory and in the field. Formulations, time of application, methods, and doses must be worked out in advance in order to avoid unnecessary damage. We sincerely urge the committee to increase the appropriation for wildlife research by \$300,000.

I concur with the National Wildlife Federation and the Wildlife Management Institute in urging that the Congress appropriate this meager \$300,000 to begin essential research. I request the chairman of the committee not to resist this request for \$300,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot agree to accept the amendment at this time, for this reason: The first we heard about the necessity for doing anything of this kind was at a hearing when the subject was brought to our attention by Mr. C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute. There was no testimony whatever from the Department. There was no budget estimate. There was none of the background which usually accompanies a request of this kind.

I agree that perhaps something should be done, but I believe that the request requires a better justification than was made before our committee as to the need. The committee considered this request, and it was turned down.

Under these circumstances, I must oppose the amendment.

I regret very much that I cannot offer the Senator from Texas any encouragement at this time. On the other hand, the Senator should tell his friends in the Wildlife Management Institute and the other organizations that if they will pursue this request another year, taking it up with the Department, and persuading the Department to ask for the appropriation in the regular way, I believe that something can be done about it.

This subject has been brought up only recently. The large-scale use of such poisons is a recent development. It is a subject which should be carefully studied before we undertake to spend money.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished chairman of the committee and the other members of the committee who sat with him in the hearings, for the appropriations which have been recommended. In a number of instances the committee has recommended increases over the budget estimate and over the House figures. I believe that the subject of the preservation of our natural resources is close to the heart of every American. The committee has done a fine job.

I am offering an amendment providing for an additional appropriation of \$300,000 to study the toxicity of the various pesticides, some of which have been described. Some of them about to go on the market are 20 times more toxic than DDT.

This is an emergency situation. An appropriation was not requested by a department of the Government, as the able chairman has pointed out. It seems to me that it would not be amiss for Congress itself to initiate such an investigation, without waiting for the executive department to request it. We believe that the need is urgent. If the Department did not believe that such an appropriation was wise, or if it could handle the situation without the appropriation, in such a manner as not to waste a dollar, advance planning could be done for a larger appropriation. The subject is of such importance that it might well justify the Senate in taking the initiative, even though the Department did not suggest the appropriation.

We believe that the committee has done a magnificent job on the bill. Among appropriations for which I particularly wish to commend the committee is that for investigation and research into the subject of saline water, with the object of removing salt from the water and converting salt water to fresh water. Many of the projects for which the committee has recommended appropriations are basic to the expansion of the American economy.

Mr. President, in offering my amendment I do not make the slightest criticism of the patient consideration which the committee has given to the bill. More than 700 pages of testimony were taken. This indicates long and patient consideration. However, I believe that the item for which I am requesting an appropriation is important.

Mr. HAYDEN. I suggest to the Senator that he tell his friends connected with the various interested organizations that they should make a representation immediately to the proper department in Washington to the effect that something should be done about the situation. If there is an emergency, and if it can be proved to the satisfaction of the department which would spend the money, it will ask for it. There will be supplemental appropriation bills coming along in which such an item could be included.

Unless those who would be expected to do the work indicated that they

wanted to do the work, we would have great difficulty in forcing money upon them. For that reason I think it would be the part of wisdom to handle the matter as I have suggested.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the chairman yield to me for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman whether or not there will be an opportunity, in connection with a supplemental appropriation bill, to present the request to the committee later during this session of Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. We can then hold hearings on the subject.

I wish to impress upon the Wildlife Management Institute and other organizations which are interested that they should take the matter up with the proper officials of the Fish and Wildlife Service and have them study the problem, so that when we call them as witnesses they will have some information to give the committee.

It is important from the standpoint of what they will do with the money that will be made available to them.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the light of the clear statement of the distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from Arizona, that there will be an opportunity given to present the matter in connection with the supplemental appropriation bill later in this session of Congress, when wildlife organizations and conservation groups will have an opportunity more fully to present the case than it was presented before the committee's regular hearing, I shall withdraw the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The amendment of the Senator from Texas is withdrawn.

The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were order to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 10746) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KNOWLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce for the RECORD that the leadership expects to program the following measures:

Calendar No. 1459, H. R. 4640, the amendment of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Calendar No. 1489, the stockyards bill, which had been referred to the Commit-

tee on Agriculture and Forestry. It is the bill which was introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Calendar No. 1490, S. 3632, the Atomic Energy Commission Acceleration Act.

Calendar No. 1497, S. 287, to investigate textile problems. I wish to talk to the chairman of the committee and some of the members of the Committee on Rules and Administration before I agree to program it, but I have reviewed it with the policy committee.

Calendar No. 1519, S. 3683, the depressed areas bill.

Calendar No. 1533, S. 299, the accelerated reclamation program bill.

None of these bills will be taken up this week.

I hope to have the printed hearings and the committee reports available on all of them. When we come back next week I hope the Senate will be able to proceed with the consideration of the accelerated reclamation program bill, to be followed by either the depressed areas bill or the stockyards bill. I understand there is some controversy with respect to the last two bills.

I make this announcement so all Members will be on notice.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Texas a question. My attention was diverted while he was making his statement. I do not know whether he listed the Wool Act extension bill for consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; I did not.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder whether we could have that bill added. Time is somewhat of the essence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the Senator's situation. I shall give it proper consideration.

CENTENNIAL YEAR OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the State of Minnesota has made phenomenal progress in the past 100 years. Nineteen hundred and fifty-eight will mark its centennial year. Last night, at a dinner given for members of Minnesota Chamber of Commerce organizations, a very interesting and thorough progress report was given on the State of Minnesota. It is one of the most complete and up-to-date word pictures I have seen in a long time. I should like permission to insert excerpts from this report in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S UP

One hundred years are up in 1958 as Minnesota celebrates its centennial. Accent will be on what's happened in the past—but let's see what's up now and in the future.

We're up in population—100 years ago it was 152,000—2 million in 1908, and now 3,313,000.

Manufacturing is our leading employer, providing 220,000 jobs that pay over a billion dollars in wages.

Second is wholesale-retail, providing over \$750 million in wages.

Then farming, which provides income of over \$600 million.

Service enterprise provides over a half-billion dollars in wages.

Our food industry is our leading manufacturer. We rank second in the Nation in this field.

Second is machinery manufacturing, then paper and pulp; fourth is printing and publishing; fifth, chemical products; sixth is ordnance; seventh, metal fabrication; eighth, transportation; and ninth, lumber and wood products.

Our kids are growing up, and going up all over Minnesota are school buildings. Up are property taxes as communities on a local level meet the need.

Minnesota is up in some pretty fast company in education. In total expenditures for higher education, we ranked seventh in the Nation.

We were up in sixth place in per pupil expenditures for public school education.

What's up with medical facilities? One of the principal factors in world-famous Rochester's growth through the years has been the Mayo Clinic. A continuing program is carried on by that institution. Right now, for instance, at the Mayo Institute, located just outside of Rochester, there is a half million dollar construction project for medical research facilities in progress. This brings the clinic's postwar building expenditure to something like \$25 million.

In Minneapolis new hospitals and remodeling of old facilities is under way, costing near \$35 million. This is Minneapolis' new health center. In St. Paul over \$27 million has or is being spent. Duluth has spent \$8 million on their hospitals.

On the drawing boards is a \$3 million new Winona hospital.

The State hospital at Brainerd typifies improvements at all State institutions. This administration building just opened, is but part of the \$12½ million program at Brainerd—other units are scheduled to start in May.

Up in welfare costs—there are only seven States who pay more per recipient in old-age pension. Minnesota is paying \$79 per recipient, 30 percent above the National average of \$60.68.

Up in child care too—only six States beat us. We're 52 percent above the national average.

Speeding up—is work on Minnesota's proposed 885 miles of Interstate Highway as pavements, grade separations and interchanges are laid down. Twin Cities expressway plans are nearing completion—Duluth's high bridge starts this fall. First Interstate funds were used on this stretch between Owatonna and Medford. Construction is under way on portions of the Interstate throughout Minnesota. Estimated cost of the Interstate in Minnesota is \$730 million. These new routes will mean much to market development and aid in attracting tourists to our State.

What's up—in Minnesota's important tourist business? Here are some of the important developments. This Stillwater marina on the St. Croix is but one of four—a new marina is being built to accommodate 500 more boats—to meet the rapidly growing boating public's needs.

Going up—at Virginia is this \$200,000 ski area on Lookout Mountain. This was sparked by the Virginia Chamber and points up the increased interest in Minnesota's recreational winter advantages.

Looking down on South St. Paul—this great competitive livestock market, second largest in the world—more than a million dollars is paid each day to Northwest livestock producers. Since livestock provides the greatest share of Northwest farm income, the top-dollar prices this market provides are of importance to the economy of

the entire Northwest. More than 6,000 persons are employed in this huge livestock and meat center, and the market has often been termed the economic barometer of Northwest agriculture. Constant improvements in stockyard and plant facilities keep the industry abreast of changing times. A new bridge over the Mississippi, part of the Interstate System—will be open by fall 1959—and will give better access to the livestock market.

Up in the air—yet down to earth—is the Twin Cities Wold Chamberlain Airport and terminal expansion. There is an \$18 million Northwest Airline base located there.

Speaking of military—up at Duluth here's the new SAGE building. Duplicate brain systems are now being installed, and will be completed in a year. Part of our new defense system, the brains will automatically give direction to these Duluth-based supersonic F-102's. But the future comes fast; thus the SAGE will guide missiles. Two missile bases are planned in the Duluth area—the Air Force's "goose" missile, designed to direct long-ranged missiles away from their target, will be based at the Duluth airport. Within 20 miles will be another base for this BOMARC missile—an unmanned interceptor.

At Rochester they are building a brandnew \$4½ million airport at a relocated 1,900-acre site.

Here is shown the home office and main plant cluster of the huge Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.—today a world-famed industrial giant which grew in St. Paul from its infancy.

A recent survey of industrial firms indicates that industry may spend upward of \$40 million in expansion in the St. Paul area during 1958 and 1959.

This is the 3-M research center—the central building shown in the foreground is where Minnesota Mining conducts its basic and long-range projects—electrical products laboratory at center—the large building still under construction in the background will house the graphic products laboratory, doing research and developmental work on such items as "Scotchlite" brand reflective sheeting and "Thermofax" brand copying equipment.

Here is a preview of tomorrow—the St. Paul West Side planned industrial district—a project well started on its way on a more than 600-acre tract of land. It includes flood control on the abutting bank of the Mississippi River and improvement of adjacent Holman Airfield.

And going up and looking up all over the State are new church facilities of every denomination. In Minneapolis alone—church constructions amount to \$10 million. The total of church construction throughout Minnesota amounts to many times this, reflecting the support for every needed spiritual values of our people.

What's up? Minnesota is up—in population—up in industry—up in per capita income—up in spirit—up in opportunity—up and going further up toward unprecedented economic growth and prestige.

What can keep Minnesota going up? We all can—businessmen and political leaders, laborers and farmers, chambers of commerce and trade associations, all working together to strengthen our business climate, to meet and beat the competition of the other 47 States—because that business climate is what the decision-making investors will appraise when they decide where to expand.

It is up to us—all of us—to be sure that the Minnesota business climate helps these decision makers decide in our favor.

THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, very few topics arouse as much discussion as the farm program. Likewise, there are very few subjects about which so many people do not have correct information. Mr. Alfred Stedman has written an excellent article in the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press for April 20 discussing a study made by the St. Paul Farm Campus under the direction of George A. Pond and Truman R. Nodland, wherein 165 farmers kept records on their income and expenditures for the period from 1946 to 1952.

The study points out that Government payments for this period were only \$62 per farm, whereas the highest average payment per farm in the 1935-39 period was \$230 per farm. Government payments comprised from 1½ to 3.1 percent of farm cash income over a 25-year period. This article should help displace comments which are often heard suggesting that farmers receive half of their income from the Government.

The May 1958 issue of the National Grange Monthly examines food prices in 1947 and 1957. It is very significant that in 1947 the farmer received \$467 out of the \$911 food budget for the average family. In 1957, the farmers' share declined to \$400, with the total cost of food rising to \$1,007. It also points out the fact that per capita farm income last year was at a record high of \$993 compared with a per capita income of nonfarmers of \$2,045. In the compilation of this \$993 per capita farm income, Secretary Benson estimated the total farm income at \$22 billion, \$6.3 billion of which came from off-the-farm employment, \$1.6 billion for home-grown foods consumed on the farm, \$1.8 billion for rent farmers did not pay because they owned their own homes and \$1.2 billion in cost-sharing payments for soil conservation and other similar practices. A question arose last year about the amount of the Department of Agriculture budget which goes to farmers in the form of subsidy payments. At that time, I explained the Agriculture budget to the Senate. Those comments point out the very small percentage of the total Department budget which is used for subsidy payments.

Price supports on commodities are intended to be a floor below which the price should not drop in times of surplus production. They have acted in times as a psychological stimulant to the market and they help keep farm prices at levels which help to prevent depression in our agricultural economy.

I ask unanimous consent that the two articles and my remarks which appear in the April 18, 1957, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be inserted in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press of April 20, 1958]

FARM SUBSIDIES

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Has the actual dirt farmer down in southern Minnesota been getting rich off subsidies from the Government? Well, what with the Soil Bank and big Government

spending on purchases of farm surpluses, the story on that has admittedly been changing some of late.

All the same, a factual study just published on the St. Paul Farm Campus covering the quarter century ending in 1952 may astonish city people and farmers.

For the story that farmers get a lot of their income as subsidies in general and Federal payments in particular is certainly widely believed.

In late years, in some parts of the country, there has been circumstantial evidence to sustain it. Uncle Sam spent a cool billion last year making payments to farmers. The Government lost more than \$3 billion buying surpluses to support farm prices. The United States Department of Agriculture budget wasn't much under half the farmers' net income from farming, though it did contain a lot of money for general public services. The debates in Congress center on more farm spending.

So the impression spreads that farmers are getting much of their income in Federal payments and maybe half or so of it from the Government. Many people feel sure of it. Even the President once revealed he had been more or less taken in by this circumstantial story.

As we said, the St. Paul farm campus study only takes us through 1952. That was in the pre-sell bank era. But it also covered nearly two decades of payments to farmers—benefit payments, production payments, conservation payments, and so on.

The study by George A. Pond and Truman R. Nodland summarizes actual business records kept by about 165 farms in Dodge, Freeborn, Goodhue, Rice, Steele, Waseca, Dakota, Le Sueur, Nicollet, Mower, Olmsted, Scott, Wabasha, and Winona Counties.

In the most recent period, 1946-52, total farm receipts on these farms averaged \$18,741 a year—\$13,852 of which went to cover farming expenses. The Government payments averaged \$62 per farm. The highest average the payments ever reached, in 1935-39, was \$230 per farm.

Year after year, the lion's share of the income of these southeastern Minnesota farms came from their sales of products—not from payments. The eminent authors of this study say: "The average proportion of the farmers' cash income from payments was only 1.5 percent for the 25 years, and in no period was over 3.1 percent."

"This," they say, "may be a surprise to those who think Government payments have been an important source of direct revenue for farmers in recent years." And how.

Is that picture changed radically now by Sell Bank payments? No. Last year only 15 out of the 165 farmers got any such payments at all. The \$34 million total this year of such payments to all Minnesota farms will be less than 3 percent of farm income from sales.

Are Government subsidies in the form of price supports bigger? Yes, but while they hold prices of the supported products up to support levels, the resulting surpluses hold prices down to those levels. And more than half the income of these southeastern Minnesota farmers came from livestock and poultry products having no price supports at all. Our farmers can and do produce primarily for market. Consumers want our good dairy, poultry, and meat products, and our fine bread wheats. The bulk of our farm income comes from sale of them to consumers, not from Government subsidies.

Farmers are commonly pictured by people who overlook all the many nonfarm subsidies as a heavily subsidized class. The southeastern Minnesota farm study shows that, at least as to payments, this is empty talk.

[From the National Grange Monthly of May 1958]

FARM FACTS: ARE FOOD PRICES TOO HIGH?

(By Fred Bailey)

Remember when Al Smith used to say: "Let's look at the record?"

There is being directed against farmers and farm programs a campaign of misrepresentation, half-truths, and abuse that can no longer be tolerated in silence.

The result, if not the objective, of that campaign has been the creation of misunderstandings and ill will between producers and consumers of farm products. Those who do this use the excuse that present farm programs are not to their liking.

That present farm programs have serious flaws is recognized by almost everyone. But, to magnify those flaws all out of proportion to their importance gives the public an entirely false impression.

You have heard and read contentions, some from official sources, that (1) food prices are exorbitant; (2) farm programs are to blame; (3) farm subsidies add to tax costs; and (4) farmers are making more money than ever before.

Let's look at the record:

Are food prices exorbitant? Measured in dollars and cents food prices are high, but they have increased less than other living costs and food takes a smaller percentage of the wage earner's income than ever before.

The average factory worker could buy a third more—and better—food in 1957 than in 1947 with wages from 1 hour of work. The reason is that factory wages (Labor Department figures) increased by 67 percent between 1947 and 1957, while retail food prices were up about 10 percent (Department of Agriculture Market Basket figures).

United States Department of Agriculture's report on retail costs, the farm value, and farm-retail spread shows:

In 1947 the Family Market Basket (weighted average of 60 foods bought by an urban wage earner) cost \$911, of which \$467 was paid to farmers and \$444 was the marketing cost.

In 1952 the Market Basket cost had increased to \$1,034, of which farmers received \$482 and marketing costs were \$552.

In 1957 the Market Basket cost was \$1,007, while farmers' share declined to \$400 and marketing costs increased to \$607.

Are farm programs to blame for high food costs? Since price supports apply only to farm production, and farm prices have declined 20 percent since 1952, farm programs cannot be blamed for any rise in food costs.

Had farm prices remained steady instead of declining between 1952 and 1957, consumers would be paying 15 percent more for their food. Had farm prices gone up by the same percentage at nonfarm prices the increase would have been at least 25 percent.

Farm programs have resulted in lower farm prices. Farm products which have been price supported averaged 25 percent lower in 1957 than in 1952. The decline in nonsupported products, such as livestock, has been considerably smaller.

Do farm subsidies add to tax costs? The Government must collect from taxpayers, sooner or later, every dollar that it spends. The Government has lost considerable amounts on price supports. The cost to the Nation of a collapse of farm prices, without supports, would have been far greater. The question isn't whether farm aid added to taxes, but whether it has been justified in the national interest.

Are farmers making more money than ever before? Secretary Benson reported recently that per capita farm income last year was at a record high of \$993. That compared with \$2,045 per capita income of non-farm workers.

But, some may say, it is cheaper to live on a farm. Is it? Let's see what Mr. Ben-

son included in that \$993. He figured that farmers had a total income last year of about \$22 billion.

That included \$7.1 billion from the sale of farm products, \$6.3 billion working at jobs off the farm by the farmer or members of his family, \$1.8 billion received by hired workers on farms, \$1.6 billion for home-grown foods consumed on the farm, \$1.8 billion for rent farmers didn't pay or because they owned their own homes, and \$1.2 billion in Government cost-sharing payments for soil conservation, etc.

Farm income from marketings were down \$350 million from 1956 to 1957, but the cost of farming was up by \$600 million. Farmers' purchasing power derived from the sale of farm products, despite record production, is the lowest in 15 years. The number of people on farms decreased by almost 2 million last year.

How have farmers been doing compared with city workers? From 1947 to 1957 average wage of factory workers increased from \$1.23 an hour to \$2.07. Farmers' income, after payment of production costs, declined from 98 cents an hour in 1947 to 69 cents in 1957. Both figures are before taxes. The purchasing power of a factory employee per hour worked last year was three times that of farm operators.

Farmers increased their production by 50 percent from 1940 to 1957, but the larger volume, when sold, would buy less manufactured goods than the much smaller volume sold in 1940.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 18, 1957]

THE FARM PROGRAM

MR. THYE. Mr. President, for the past several months we have heard many references to what the overall cost of the farm program has been to the United States Government. For that reason, I shall cite the facts, as best I can, from information obtained from the Department of Agriculture and the statistical records of the Department.

The total agricultural budget for 1958 amounts to approximately \$4.9 billion.

It should be pointed out that, of the total agricultural budget, approximately \$2.7 billion, or more than half, is attributable to programs which are not designed, primarily and only, as aids to farmers.

Some of these programs are: Meat inspection program, school lunch program, the foreign aid program, forestry payments to schools, and disaster donations. The costs of these and a few others total approximately \$1.7 billion.

Also included here are loan authorizations for REA and FHA, which will be repaid over a period of years. These authorizations in the 1958 budget amount to \$474.5 million, while collections in 1958 are estimated at \$331.9 million.

It should also be pointed out that certain other receipt items should be deducted from the budget, such as proceeds from sales of timber, grazing leases, and sugar-tax receipts, which amount to \$245.9 million.

After having made these necessary adjustments, we get a more true picture of how much of the total budget for the Department of Agriculture is chargeable to agriculture. This amounts to \$2,162,000,000.

When we go into the Department of Agriculture budget for fiscal 1958 item by item, we find that it becomes a very interesting study. The original budget was \$5,127,300,000. The budget was later reduced by \$254 million.

The obligational authority for 1958 is \$4,873,300,000.

I now show the breakdown for the specific functions within the Department of Agriculture.

"Agricultural Research Service, \$95,100,000."

Experiment stations are included in the research item.

"Plant and animal pest control, \$27 million."

"Meat inspection, \$18.7 million."

Mr. President, meat inspection is conducted for the safety of the consumers. It is a consumer service.

"Meat inspection, \$18.7 million."

"Extension, \$64.1 million."

Mr. President, that service has been in existence for years. It is the educational part of the agricultural function.

	Million
"Farmer Cooperative Service....."	\$0.6
Forest Service (receipts for sales of timber, grazing, etc. 161.4).....	126.9
Soll Conservation Service:	
Conservation operation.....	73.5
Watershed protection and flood prevention.....	39.1
Great Plains conservation.....	20.0
Agricultural Conservation Service.....	237.0
Agricultural Marketing Service: Marketing research service.....	31.9

"School lunch program, \$100 million."

Mr. President, that is charged to agriculture, and yet it is a direct school lunch program.

"Foreign Agricultural Service, \$4,400,000."

"Commodity Exchange Authority, \$800,000."

"Soll Bank, \$1 billion."

"Commodity Stabilization Service—

"Acreage allotment and marketing quotas, \$43 million."

"Sugar Act program, \$72,200,000."

Income from sugar taxes, Mr. President, is \$84½ million. So any administrative cost in the Sugar Act is actually reimbursed by the tax which is imposed upon sugar. Yet the cost of the Sugar Act program is charged to agriculture.

"REA (salaries and expenses), \$9,600,000."

"Loan authority, \$239 million."

The 1958 estimate of collections is \$137½ million.

"Farmers Home Administration (salaries and expenses), \$30 million."

"Loan authority, \$235,500,000."

Collections in 1958 are estimated at \$194.4 million.

"Staff officers, \$8,200,000."

"Restoration of Commodity Credit Corporation capital impairment (to repay CCC losses in the year 1956), \$1,239,800,000."

"Reimbursement of CCC for financial program, \$843,100,000."

"Title I, Public Law 480, \$637 million."

"Title II, Donations, \$94,500,000."

"International Wheat Agreement, \$93 million."

Now we come to the permanent appropriations. Section 32 provides a donation of \$233½ million, which is taken out of section 32 funds. Section 32 funds, Mr. President, are made up of the tariff duties which are collected on imports which come in direct competition with agricultural commodities produced in the United States and the funds are accumulated for the purpose of paying for perishable commodities on a support basis.

The permanent appropriation for this particular fund is \$306.5 million.

The payment to counties for schools from forest receipts is \$47.3 million.

All these items, Mr. President, total \$4,873.3 million, which we have so often heard referred to as the appropriation for agriculture, oftentimes thought of by the taxpayers, because of the way it is phrased, as a subsidy, or a direct Treasury check.

Mr. President, I have a tabulation of programs shown in the agricultural budget of 1958 which benefit others than farmers:

"Meat inspection, \$18.7 million."

"Watershed projects, \$39.1 million."

"School-lunch program, \$100 million."

"Section 416 donations, \$361.3 million."

"Public Law 480, title I, \$637 million."

"Title II donations for relief, etc., \$94.5 million."

The International Wheat Agreement is a part of the State Department's function. That is \$93 million.

I have described section 32, for which the figure was \$223.5 million.

Mr. President, the remainder of this table I shall not read, because it refers to the figures I read on the other page. I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of this one page be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks. It continues with the school milk program, the REA, the FHA, and it shows the total receipts from timber sales and collections under REA and FHA.

There being no objection, the remainder of the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[In millions]	
"Forest payments to counties for schools	\$47.3
School-milk program.....	45.0
Subtotal.....	1,659.4
REA loan authority.....	239.0
FHA loan authority.....	235.5
Subtotal of loans (loan authority to be repaid)	474.5
Total	2,133.9
Receipts received by agriculture:	
Timber sales, grazing leases, etc	161.4
REA collections (estimated 1958)	137.5
FHA collections (estimated 1958)	194.4
Sugar taxes.....	84.5
Total receipts.....	577.8
Total to be deducted from budget	2,711.7
Total agricultural budget.....	4,873.3
	—2,711.7
Total chargeable directly to agriculture.....	2,161.6"

Mr. THYE. The most significant part of this, Mr. President, is the table following, relating to "Realized Net Income, Direct Government Payments, and Direct Payments as a Percent of Net Income."

I have gone back into the years 1936 and 1937, because they were prewar years. Then I have taken the years in the postwar era, 1946 and 1947. Then I have taken the last calendar year available, which is 1956.

In 1936 the realized net income—this is agricultural net income—was \$5.1 billion.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is that the income of the farmers?

Mr. THYE. It is the realized net income of the farmers.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is the amount the farmers received?

Mr. THYE. Yes. It is the realized net income for 1936, and it amounted to \$5.1 billion.

Direct Government payments to farmers—I repeat that, direct Government payments to farmers—\$300 million.

The next is the direct payments as a percentage of realized net income. That is 5.9 percent.

Then we go to the calendar year 1937. The realized net income was \$5.2 billion. The direct Government payments to farmers were \$300 million, or 5.8 percent of realized net income.

Next we go to the calendar year 1946. This is the immediate postwar year, after World War II. The realized net income was \$15 billion. The direct Government payments to farmers were \$800 million, or 5.3 percent of realized net income.

In 1947 the realized net income was \$17.2 billion. The direct Government payments to farmers were \$300 million. The direct payments as a percentage of realized net income were 1.7 percent.

The last year, the most recent year, was 1956. The realized net income was \$11.8 billion. The direct Government payments to farmers were \$600 million. Six hundred million dollars is the only figure given for the direct payments to the farmers in 1956, Mr. President. In other words, the direct payments as a percentage of the realized net income amounted to 5.1 percent.

Now I should like to refer to another table, which covers the estimated direct payments to farmers in millions of dollars.

The ACP program in 1957 amounted to \$245.3 million.

For 1958, this item is \$253 million.

Under the Wool Act, the estimated direct payment to farmers in millions of dollars is \$60 million for 1957. The anticipated payments for 1958 are \$55 million.

In connection with the Soll Bank, direct payments to farmers for 1957 are \$387 million; and the estimated direct payment to farmers in millions of dollars for the calendar year 1958 will be \$896 million.

Under the Sugar Act, the cost to this Government in 1957 was \$65.5 million. The anticipated cost for 1958 will be \$70.1 million.

The next item is the Great Plains. The estimated direct payment to farmers for 1958 will be \$17.7 million.

Stating it in another way, in the calendar year 1957 the estimated direct payment to farmers, in millions of dollars, is \$757.8 million. The total anticipated for the calendar year 1958 is \$1,291,800,000. It will not be \$4 billion, \$5 billion, or \$5½ billion, the figures we have so often heard stated in recent months. I had to go into these figures and place them in the Record in order that we and the taxpayers might understand what is involved in the farm program, and in the total administrative responsibilities and functions of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota for calling the attention of the Senate to some factual figures which show the actual payments to the farmers of the Nation. The senior Senator from Minnesota has always been an effective spokesman for our great agricultural economy. He has a keen knowledge of agriculture gleaned from many years of actual experience as a successful farm operator. He is considered a leading authority in this important area of our Nation's economy. There is no man more dedicated to the betterment of agriculture in the United States, than the senior Senator from Minnesota.

I think it is most unfortunate that during the past few months we have been reading figures which have been generally distributed over the Nation, to the effect that the farm programs cost \$5.5 billion or more, and that the farm income is only about \$11 billion; in other words, that the cost of the farm program is 50 percent of the farm income.

I think the Senator from Minnesota has rendered agriculture a real service. It is time these figures were made known to the people of the Nation. Otherwise they, too, would be concerned, as we are, over these payments which, in reality, are not so large considering the great program as a whole. The American farmer sustained our needs during World War II and the Korean conflict. Today the farmer is producing to

sustain our growing needs and demands for agricultural products, both at home and abroad. The farmers of our Nation must not be made the victims of statistical errors concerning subsidy payments.

Mr. THYE. I thank my distinguished friend from Kansas. He has always been a loyal supporter of sound legislation for our Nation's farmers and has recognized their contribution to our ever-expanding agricultural economy.

Mr. President, I have just been given by my administrative assistant a release which has come over the United Press wire service. This is the statement:

"Acting Assistant Press Secretary Wayne Hawks just clarified the President's statement on farm subsidies. He said: 'The \$5 billion figure represents about one-half of the net income of all farmers in the United States. The figure is not all subsidy as the President's remarks implied.'"

I am grateful that this clarification has been made. I know that it would have been a disservice to cause me and others to labor under the impression that agriculture would be charged with such a burden as was suggested when it was stated that \$5 billion was the cost of the farm programs to the Treasury. That was what led me to go into the statistical records to obtain the facts and introduce them on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

Agriculture is doing too good a job to be placed under a cloud of taxpayers' criticism. The American farmer not only met the needs of the Nation during the war years, not only supplied the food and fiber which our allies needed, but supplied the materials for many a gallon of alcohol which was processed into synthetic rubber and ammunition in the war years.

American agriculture deserves better than to be constantly charged with being such a burden to the United States Treasury. We have won friends all over the world with the surplus products from the good earth of the United States. The United States and Canada are the great bread-producing areas of the world, as well as being producers of foods and fibers, timber, cotton, animal fats, and fatty products from vegetable crops. American agriculture has done such an outstanding job that it should be commended rather than being placed under a cloud of charges to the effect that a burden of possibly \$5 billion has been imposed on the Treasury of the United States to support the farm economy of the Nation.

RETIREMENT OF ALFRED MYNDERS, EDITOR OF THE CHATTANOOGA TIMES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this past weekend Alfred Mynders' retirement as editor of the Chattanooga Times was announced.

I want to express on the floor of the Senate my great respect for him, his integrity and his journalistic ability. Without doubt his career has been one of the most distinguished in the South, and I am glad to say that in retirement his voice will not be stilled, for he will continue to write a column for the Times editorial page.

As many Senators know, the Chattanooga Times is the mother newspaper of the New York Times. These two papers share a distinction for accurate and responsible journalism. Mr. Mynders served that distinction well during all his years as a journalist, which have been many and fruitful.

A native of Hartsville, Tenn., he began his newspaper work with the Knoxville

Sentinel—now the Knoxville News-Sentinel—while still in college. He moved to Chattanooga in 1909 as news editor and editorial writer of the Chattanooga News. During World War I he served overseas and after the war joined the staff of the Memphis Commercial Appeal and later served as managing editor of the Memphis Evening Appeal. For one summer during that period he worked on the staff of the Paris edition of the Chicago Tribune.

In 1928 Mynders returned to Chattanooga and the Chattanooga News, later served on the Chattanooga Tribune and in 1940 rejoined the Chattanooga Times organization. He became editor of the Chattanooga Times in 1942. As the Chattanooga Times itself says:

Throughout his years of direction of the editorial policy of the Times he has become known for his deep concern for the welfare of his fellow men, expressed in warm terms and polished phrases.

Mr. Mynders will be replaced as editor by Martin S. Ochs, who at a young age showed himself to be in the true tradition of his family by adopting a journalistic career. On the Chattanooga Times and the New York Times he has served in capacities of reporter, foreign correspondent, and columnist. He has been associate editor of the Chattanooga Times for the past 3 years. I wish him the greatest success in his new responsibilities, and share the confidence of the paper's publisher in his ability to carry on in the tradition of this newspaper.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a statement of Ben Hale Golden, publisher of the Chattanooga Times, announcing this change, which was published in that paper on Sunday, April 27, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATEMENT

Effective today, Alfred D. Mynders retires as editor of the Chattanooga Times and Martin S. Ochs is appointed to succeed Mr. Mynders.

During the 16 years of Mr. Mynders' editorship, the Times achieved new distinction in the field of journalism. Mr. Mynders is regarded by many newspapermen in the South as a brilliant editorial writer and one of the finest columnists in the country. Mr. Mynders' retirement comes as he nears his 70th birthday and all of his associates on the Times extend their heartiest congratulations on a job well done.

Mr. Mynders will continue his association with the Times by producing the column Looking Backward that appears on our editorial page.

Mr. Ochs, I am sure, will carry on the tradition of liberal and fearless interpretation of the news and will accurately reflect and appraise events as they affect this changing world. He comes of a newspaper family steeped in the traditions of a free and responsible press. His great-uncle, Adolph Simon Ochs, is regarded as the man who laid down the conception of journalistic responsibility to readers of newspapers. Adolph Simon Ochs started his brilliant career as a newspaperman in this city and on this paper, which he published from 1878 until his death in 1935.

The Times has one of the finest newspaper traditions. It has been a great newspaper in the past and must continue to be so.

I have every confidence in Martin S. Ochs' ability to supervise an editorial page in the high standards and ideals of the Chattanooga Times.

BEN HALE GOLDEN,
Publisher.

FINAL REPORT OF THE ALEXANDER HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL COM- MISSION (S. DOC. NO. 95)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, today marks the concluding day of the life of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, created by an act of Congress which was initiated in the Senate.

I have in my hand a letter of transmittal addressed to the Honorable RICHARD NIXON, President of the Senate, which reads as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, named to signalize the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton, has the honor to submit the following final report, in connection with section 6, Public Law 601, chapter 770, 83d Congress, 2d session, approved August 20, 1954, as amended.

Respectfully,

KARL E. MUNDT,
Chairman.

In submitting the report, I should like to express my appreciation to all of the members of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, both the public members, who have come to us from Government and as Members of Congress, and the private members. I ask unanimous consent that there appear at this point in the RECORD the names of the Commission members as they appear on the letterhead of the Commission stationery.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ex officio: The President of the United States; the Vice President of the United States; the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Chairman: KARL E. MUNDT, United States Senate, South Dakota.

Vice Chairman: FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., House of Representatives, New York.

United States Senate: HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Virginia; THOMAS C. HENNING, JR., Missouri; IRVING M. IVES, New York.

House of Representatives: CARROLL REECE, Tennessee; PETER W. RODINO, JR., New Jersey; JOHN J. ROONEY, New York.

Presidential Commissioners: Lt. Gen. Milton G. Baker, Pennsylvania; Edward R. Burke, Maryland; Mrs. Marie Brown Coffin, District of Columbia; Laurens M. Hamilton, Virginia; George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury; Clark Haynes Minor, New York; Dr. John A. Krout, New York; Mrs. Robert P. Patterson, New York.

Secretary: W. Randolph Burgess, Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Assistant Secretary: Robert A. Dillon, Treasury Department.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I also express my appreciation to the very fine, loyal, and hard-working staff which served during the lifetime of the Commission. It was headed by Mr. J. Harvie Williams, Director, who did a very fine and constructive job. He used creative imagination and vision to bring into focus the great many methods by which we could bring the distinguished career and the productivity of Alexander Hamilton to the attention not only

of the students of America, but of the general public as well. He was ably assisted by his public relations counsel, Mr. John Underhill.

In addition to Mr. Williams, Dr. Frank Monaghan, the historian of the Commission, contributed greatly to the scholarly background and work of the Commission and to our program to bring forth new facts, new studies, and new compendiums of the writing and thinking of Alexander Hamilton.

I pay tribute also to Mr. Frederick D. Hunt, Deputy Director; Robert I. Berger, radio and television director; Richard C. D. Hunt, who did historical research; and to the other staff members: John A. DeChant, Virginia E. Kress, Madelyn V. Rush, Hertha J. Bohrer, Gladys Houchin, Lola E. Hutchings, Worth Bailey, Pearl Mae Nichols, Chester Spurgeon, Angele de Transltes Gingras, and Mrs. Vera Ash, all of whom worked diligently and hard to make the work of our Commission a success.

We are proud of the work of the Commission and of the fact that the work was carried on economically, without the expenditure of a vast amount of money, and that it will have good and lasting effects.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to file the final report of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, and that it be printed, with whatever illustrations and graphs are incorporated, as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report of the Commission will be received and appropriately printed.

PEACE WITH JUSTICE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, recently there came to my attention a very outstanding address, delivered by Mr. Lester H. Woolsey, president of the American Society of International Law. The address was delivered at the 51st annual meeting of the American Society of International Law, which met in Washington last year.

I think the address merits careful reading and consideration by all Members of the Senate and by people generally who have a responsibility or feel a special interest in the subject of peace with justice, which is the title of the address.

Mr. Woolsey, because of his long experience in the field of international law, has given to this particular paper the maturity of opinion, the maturity of observation, and the scholarly approach, which make it very unusual, in my judgment.

He discusses the difference between political questions and legal questions, and points out the difficulty which any international organization finds when a body such as the United Nations, having constituent members, attempts to address itself to questions which have political implications. But Mr. Woolsey also makes constructive suggestions.

Therefore, because I believe it is more than an ordinary paper, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD. I earnestly commend it to the Members of the Senate,

CIV—487

and particularly to the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, especially the Subcommittee on Disarmament.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the proceedings of the 51st annual meeting of the American Society of International Law, Thursday, April 25, 1957]

This session convened at 8:15 p. m., in the Congressional Room, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., President Lester H. Woolsey presiding.

President Woolsey opened the session and read the following telegraph message from President Eisenhower:

AUGUSTA, GA., April 25, 1957.

LESTER H. WOOLSEY, Esq.,
President of the American Society of International Law:

To those participating in the 51st annual meeting of the American Society of International Law, I send greetings.

Your organization holds a place of honor among our learned societies. Your studies, critical analyses and creative thinking in the field of international law have created better understanding of the complex problems of law and justice around the world. As you join in seeking to establish a firm and enduring peace, based upon the rule of law among nations, you have the deep appreciation and firm support of all men of good will.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

PEACE WITH JUSTICE—A COMMENTARY

(By Lester H. Woolsey, president of the society)

Peace with justice—do these words sound familiar to you? They must. You hear them so often. Almost every state paper contains those words, often repeated. They were the burden of President Wilson's state papers, the basis of President Eisenhower's prayer at his second inauguration, the goal in the recent Declaration of Panama. These words have come to be a symbol of our thinking in these tormented times in world affairs. So it bids us to try to understand what these words mean.

What is the peace we are thinking of? Prevention of war alone is not peace. Armistices and cease-fires are not peace. Is the condition in Korea, Vietnam, Formosa, or Israel one of peace? Obviously something more must be added. Let us take an example.

UNITED STATES AND CANADA

The condition of relations between the United States and Canada comes, I believe, as near to international peace as anyone could well imagine. A boundary line of some 3,000 miles for the past 160 years without a fort or a gun and only 3 or 4 gunboats for customs guard, is at least remarkable today. What has brought about this state of affairs. Canadians have no fear of the United States and vice versa. Both sides are satisfied with the existing situation. There are minor disputes, of course, such as the question of damage on the American side from fumes of Canadian smelters, or from works on one side which unduly raise the water level on the other shore, recent disputes over the use of the waters of international rivers such as the Columbia River. But does either side fly to arms on that account? They do not even raise the tempo of international feeling. They are referred to arbitration or to a technical commission for a disinterested report to be used as a basis of settlement.

To attain such a condition of peace, it is necessary that there should be trust and confidence on both sides of the border and machinery for the settlement of disputes which are sure to arise. Of course, in this example,

peaceful relations are aided by identity of language and to a large extent of institutions and aspirations born of freedom.

The four freedoms are taken for granted. Freedom in America means freedom of choice, freedom to choose our government, freedom to speak our minds, freedom to worship as we please, and some disciplinary measures for maintaining these freedoms under law. It means also equality before the law, and opportunity to satisfy human wants.

Foreign Minister Pinay of France said in the United Nations in September 1955:

"What is needed is the establishment of peace among the nations in an atmosphere of mutual confidence. This is a long-range undertaking, because confidence cannot be commanded, it has to be earned. It is earned by honesty of thought and tested by consistency of action."

Similar conditions of real peace prevail between several countries, especially between some of the South American countries and the Scandinavian countries, for like reasons.

GERMANY AND FRANCE

Now, take a contrasting example, namely, Germany and France. These countries have been at war to the death 3 times in 70 years, and also earlier. An inborn animosity and rivalry existed between them sharpened by suspicion and mistrust as to the other's aims and ambitions. The frontier was fortified by the Maginot and Hindenburg Lines which glared at each other across the border.

Also, huge armaments were built up on both sides and maintained to the utmost of military perfection. Pieces of border territory have changed hands more than once and raised irritating Irredentist problems as in Alsace-Lorraine. Such peace as existed between conflicts was merely an armed truce or powder-keg peace.

This obviously was not a peaceful relationship, although treaties of perpetual peace existed and were in one instance, as after World War I, guaranteed by other nations in the Locarno Treaties and aided by machinery for settling disputes.

What has made this pseudo peace an utter failure? It may be easily answered that there was a lack of sincere trust and confidence in the peaceful aims of the other party. This was true, but this does not reach the bottom of the question. Indeed, after World War I, both countries were reasonably free politically, spiritually, and materially. On this unstable situation, Hitler cast the blight of nazism and the die was cast for war.

The Franco-German animosity and rivalry had become an internal political football and disputes could not be settled calmly and on their merits in such an inflammatory situation. How can this state of international feeling be brought to the level of the United States-Canadian trust and confidence?

These attributes are attained only through years of freedom, of honorable and fair dealing without acrimonious and spiteful propaganda and attempts to overreach each other. This is not an overnight solution, a solution of immediacy. Nor, of course, can it be obtained by force or be purchased by grants of financial or material aid.

RUSSIA AND ITS NEIGHBORS

Take another case—the Communist threat which involves the great countries of Russia and China, the smaller nations of eastern Europe and Southeast Asia. It is not necessary to discuss here the tenets of communism as dictated by Stalin, now recently given a new look by Khrushchev and again revised by him.

The recent events in Hungary are of a piece with what occurred in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Korea, China, and Vietnam, and point up the characteristics which make communism abhorrent to the free nations of the West. It is a crusade led and nurtured

by a tommygun empire with no moral restraints.

It is trite to say that a cold war is not peace. The trust and confidence and freedom that peace requires for its germination and nourishment are wholly lacking. Can they be attained in the present atmosphere? The Bandung Conference laid down five sensible principles for reducing tensions; namely, noninterference in internal affairs, respect for the sovereignty and integrity of nations, refraining from acts of aggression and so on, but communism does not live up to them.

For example, Russia says her action in Hungary is a purely internal matter of no international concern. It is clear that the imposition of totalitarian regimes on free peoples by aggression, infiltration or subversion undermines the foundations of the United Nations and international peace. Preventing war alone is not enough in such a case. Mr. Vishinsky, the late chief Russian delegate to the United Nations, has emphasized this. He said: "We shall conquer the world, not with atomic bombs, but with our ideas, our brains, and our doctrines."

Therefore, international communism is openly opposed to international peace, except under its own dominion—a Communist peace, in a limited sense similar to the enforced peace of the Roman Empire.

PEACE BY FORCE—OR ELSE

In this context, we may note that in the present atomic age and particularly in the present deterrent phase (with total destruction overhanging the countries of the world like the sword of Damocles) there exists at the moment a sort of peace by force or else. Witness the Soviet threat to Britain and France at the time of their invasion of Egypt. Surely this is not the kind of peace we desire or have in mind.

The President did radiate confidence at the summit conference at Geneva. Even the Russians were convinced of his sincerity of purpose and of his determination not to begin an atomic war. Did the Russians do the same? By repudiating their promises they did exactly the opposite. How can we ever get to equal terms in trust and confidence with the Russians?

Peace in the present civilization must be based on moral principles, on the sanctity of promises we live by, on the principles of right and wrong and fair dealing of everyday life. These principles instill trust and confidence and are the only ones that will. President Wilson believed that the moral law was the strongest force in the world, and President Eisenhower envisages a world where moral law prevails.

Nehru said on his visit to President Eisenhower in Washington in December 1956 that the President represents not only the power and might of the United States "but a certain moral quality that in the uncommitted areas is regarded in the final analysis as something bigger."

So now we come to the concomitant term of peace, namely, justice. Peace and justice are faces of the same coin. They go together. Peace cannot be attained without justice. Injustice breeds discontent and friction. Neither can there be justice without peace. Justice does not thrive in the temper of strife.

PEACE AND JUSTICE

Justice is usually thought of in connection with a dispute or controversy of some kind. For centuries now, in internal affairs, since the time of trial by battle, men have felt that the nearest approach to justice in a dispute is obtained by referring the dispute for decision to a court, that is, to a body of disinterested persons qualified to pass upon the question at issue. In the international field this procedure was first exercised by referring the dispute to a tem-

porary board of arbitrators. Not until the Treaty of Versailles was there created a permanent Court of Nations. This was continued in the United Nations Charter and called the International Court of Justice. This World Court has a general jurisdiction of "all cases which the parties refer to it" and other matters provided for in the charter or other treaties in force. A number of small countries have agreed to be sued by another country in any dispute involving certain "legal" questions, that is, to be haled into court on a simple complaint by another country without the necessity of a preliminary agreement. The great powers reject this simple procedure and lay down limitations on jurisdiction as to time limit, reciprocity, new cases, etc. The United States, for example, denies jurisdiction over any question which it considers to be a domestic question. The result of such restrictions is to leave the Court with comparatively little to do. Aside from special arbitration treaties, this is the judicial regime for the community of nations. I have classed arbitration courts as judicial courts, since J. B. Moore so regards them in his digest.

Courts, however, are not infallible instruments of justice. For example, a court may base its decision on a technical point which obscures the merits and denies justice. The North American Dredging case before United States-Mexican Claims Commission is in point. The claimant had a contract with the Mexican Government to dredge certain harbors. It did the dredging, Mexico issued certificates of work completed and payments due, but no payments were made for lack of funds. The contract contained the Calvo clause denying resort to diplomatic intervention. The Commission upheld the clause and dismissed the case. The company was not paid for the work it admittedly had done and for which payment was admitted to be due. This was corrected by a later domestic commission.

There was a group of claims against Venezuela in which the protocol of reference instructed the arbitrators to decide the cases according to absolute equity and without regard to technical rules. Certain of the claims were dismissed. The decisions were protested by the United States as being contrary to the protocol, and later the same cases were by agreement put before the Hague Court which studiously avoided all technicalities and handed down additional awards (*Orinoco Steamship Co. v. Venezuela*, Hague Court Reports, p. 236).

LEGAL QUESTIONS JUSTIFIABLE

Arbitration cases have as a rule dealt with losses of property or lives which were capable of being measured in money damages. It should be emphasized that these damage cases, however, have not generally been such as would have prevented war. They commonly involved legal questions for the most part.

On the whole we must conclude that by and large over the years, court machinery in the international field, whether in ad hoc units or permanent form, has dispensed justice in generally acceptable measure. The judicial process should be so formulated as to get to the merits of a case regardless of technicalities and special rules of law or procedure.

Secretary Dulles has summarized the judicial process under the charter in this language:

"Here we find, despite much lip service to that process, most nations prefer to seek a settlement of their disputes by diplomatic means or perhaps they prefer to keep the dispute open for domestic, political reasons."

There has been roughly an average of approximately one decision on the merits, not counting orders and advisory opinions, per year during the life of the old and the new World Courts. Out of all of the numerous

disputes existing in the world in that period, this, he said, is a poor showing. "It demonstrates that nations are reluctant to settle serious disputes on the basis of rules of law."

The foregoing relates to justiciable disputes, that is, disputes resolvable by application of rules of law. However, there are disputes that are not so resolvable and these have been classed as political disputes. Law courts, as a rule, reject such disputes as beyond their competence.

Surprisingly, however, there seems to be some difference of opinion as to whether an international court should handle both legal and political questions. This problem arose early before the United States Supreme Court.

Analogy to an international court is sought in the United States Supreme Court to which the Constitution (by agreement of the States) grants jurisdiction of "controversies between two or more States," without stating any exception.

WHAT OF POLITICAL QUESTIONS?

In the case of *Rhode Island v. Massachusetts* (12 Peters 657) the Supreme Court said that disputes between States are political when the sovereign reserves the right to decide them, but that when a dispute is referred to the Court it ceases to be political and is to be decided by rules of law appropriate to the case. Nevertheless, in the later case of *Pacific T. & T. Co. v. Oregon* (223 U. S. 118), the Court held that whether Oregon had a republican form of government as guaranteed by the Constitution was a political question for decision by the Executive or Congress. Professor Burdick cites a few other cases in which the Supreme Court refused to consider political controversies (Law of the American Constitution, p. 130 ff.).¹ In this connection we might consider what has been said about arbitration of all kinds of questions.

President Taft in connection with the General Arbitration Treaty of 1912 saw no reason why States should not agree to arbitrate all questions no matter what they involve—honor, territory, or money. He said:

"I have noticed exceptions in our arbitration treaties, as to reference of questions of honor, of national honor, to courts of arbitration. Personally, I do not see any more reason why matters of national honor should not be referred to a court of arbitration any more than matters of property or matters of national proprietorship. . . ."

"But I do not see why questions of honor may not be submitted to a tribunal supposed to be composed of men of honor who understand questions of national honor, to abide by their decision, as well as any other question of difference arising between nations. . . ."

"If now we can negotiate and put through a positive agreement with some great nation to abide by the adjudication of an international arbitral court in every issue which cannot be settled by negotiation, no matter what it involves, whether honor, territory, or money, we shall have made a long step forward by demonstrating that it is possible for two nations at least to establish as between them the same system of due process of law that exists between individuals under a government" (5 American Journal of International Law, 720 ff. (1911)).

Mr. Root, speaking on that treaty in the Senate, thought there were matters which could not be arbitrated, such as questions involving a nation's independence, a place to live in, and generally questions of national policy.

When the Permanent Court of International Justice was created as the judicial

¹ Dickinson cites a number of such cases in his excellent paper, *The Law of Nations as National Law: Political Questions* (104 U. of Pa. Law Rev. 451-493 (1956)).

arm of the League of Nations, the statute of the Court defined its jurisdiction to comprise "all cases which the parties refer to it" and all matters specially provided for in the covenant and in treaties and conventions in force. This provision was carried over into the statute of the International Court of Justice under the Charter of the United Nations. And any question of competence was to be decided by the Court.

Did it have jurisdiction of political questions? The distinction was early envisaged. The members of the League were obligated to submit to the Council, a political body, any dispute likely to lead to a rupture which was not submitted to arbitration or judicial settlement. Accordingly, when Great Britain acceded to the optional clause, which was limited to legal cases, she reserved the right to submit a dispute which she believed to be political to the Council for adjustment.

The Permanent Court itself soon had the question before it. In the case of the free zones of upper Savoy, the Court said in effect that political cases, in particular tariff questions, were not for a court of justice which applied rules of law.

Judge Kellogg, concurring in the dissenting opinion on the merits, filed a special opinion to the effect that the Court's jurisdiction did not include political questions and was not broadened in this respect by the *ex aequo et bono* clause. He said:

"What is a political question? It is a question which is exclusively within the competence of a sovereign state. The making of tariff regulations, the regulation of immigration, the imposition of taxes, and in short the exercise of all governmental power necessarily inherent in a sovereign state, involve questions of this nature. In passing upon a political question there is no rule or principle of law, no norm of equity, justice, or even good conscience which the Court can apply; for unless limited by treaties, the power of a state in this domain is unlimited." (2 Hudson, World Court Reports 507.)

Furthermore, he said the provision in the covenant that the Court's jurisdiction comprises all cases which the parties refer to it "does not authorize this Court to take jurisdiction of purely political questions." He indicated that diplomacy, arbitration, and the League of Nations were available for the adjustment of such questions. He added that the competence of the Court in this case extends only to the determination of the legal rights of the parties and that it could not, even with their consent and at their request, settle such political questions as may be involved in this case. (Idem, p. 508.)

In the case of the Austro-German customs regime the dissenting opinion held that "the Court is not concerned with political considerations nor with political consequences. These lie outside its competence." Here it may be interpolated that purely legal questions may become political if the interested governments make the issue one of government policy and refuse to submit it to legal determination.

In the interim when the new World Court was being considered, Justice Jackson, of the United States Supreme Court, from this rostrum in 1945 declared "the World Court's jurisdiction should be confined to matters really justiciable," and should not include "cases which are really political in their nature and require to be dealt with by means of a political decision and not by reference to a court of law."

Indeed, the Inter-Allied Drafting Committee, said Justice Jackson, advised that the prestige of the Court required that "its jurisdiction should be confined to matters which are really justiciable and that all possibility should be excluded of its being able to deal with cases which are really political in their nature and require to be dealt with by means of a political decision and not by reference

to a court of law" (1945 Proceedings, American Society of International Law 14). Article 36 of the Charter provides that the Security Council should consider that legal disputes should go as a general rule before the World Court.

POLITICAL QUESTIONS LEAD TO WARS

Assuming, then, that the better opinion and practice is that courts of justice should not pass upon political matters, where are such questions to go for determination or adjustment?

These matters involve the highest policies of government and the profoundest disputes between nations, as they may impinge on independence, honor, and vital interests. They often lead to war. What provision has been made to bring about justice in such political controversies?

There were sporadic attempts made in conferences of the great powers and in the concert of Europe, the Hague conferences, the Pan American conferences, the Locarno treaties, to do something in this area, but no organization was created for this purpose until the Covenant of the League came into force in 1920. The covenant established the Council, a political body, composed finally of 15-member nations, to which was to be submitted "any dispute likely to lead to a rupture" if not referred to arbitration or adjudication. The Council handled a few political cases.

The aim of the United Nations, like that of the League, is to prevent war, that is, to settle disputes and to clear up situations that might lead to war or to stop war itself. This, of course, involves settling political questions of the most dangerous sort. So now the United Nations and the regional organizations, like the Organization of American States and others, are the organs or courts for the settlement of political controversies between states.

THE U. N. AS A COURT

Let us consider the United Nations as such a court:

(1) Although law courts usually reject political questions, political bodies often undertake unfortunately to decide legal questions. Therein lies one of the roadblocks to justice. The record of the United Nations in this regard is not envious.

A committee of this society headed by Professors Chamberlain and Sohn, reporting on the practice of the United Nations bodies when their competence is challenged, found that if a nation feels that a decision is unconstitutional, a member may refuse to follow it, as has happened in several instances. A claim of non-competence, instead of being sent to the World Court, often results in a weaker proposal put forward in the hope that the challenging state will accept it without further objection. Also, the doubt may result in so many abstentions as to defeat a two-thirds vote.

This is a corrosive influence on the authority of the United Nations which could be avoided by an authoritative decision of an impartial tribunal on the question of competence.

In the Indonesia, Tunis, Algeria, Morocco, South Africa and Cyprus debates the defendant countries claimed a domestic question under article 2 but it appears that the Assembly or its committees declined to submit it to the World Court. In the South African case, President Pearson moved to have a vote of the Assembly on the question of competence. His motion was voted down 41 to 10.

The action of the United Nations in the admission of the package of 16 new members in 1955 was perhaps the most irresponsible decision of record. There had been an advisory opinion by the World Court as to the principles governing the admission of new members under article 4. There were the explicit requirements of

article 4 that a new member should be a peace-loving state and that admission shall be effected by a decision of the Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council, yet the Security Council by an admittedly political decision in the interest of universality disregarded the advisory opinion and the provisions of article 4 had voted for the admission of the package doubtless as a deal. Members who noted the illegality of this procedure winked at it by deciding to abstain rather than vote against it.

The United Nations Assembly, though a purely political body, is prone to decide or to defer legal questions on a political basis. Thus, it attempts to interpret the meaning of the charter which is purely a legal question and should go to the World Court for decision. But the contrary is the practice, which, I note, has been justified by certain comments made at the San Francisco Conference.

Mr. Dulles, in his address before this society at the last annual meeting, recognized the political character of the Assembly and its decisions. He said:

"It must, however, be recognized that debates in the General Assembly in relation to resolutions calling for change tend to be emotional, and votes are sometimes cast not on the basis of impartial study and judgment of the facts, but rather on the basis of political alignment of the members, and sometimes on the basis of what one might refer to as international log-rolling. * * * It arouses nationalistic sentiments."

The potentialities in article 14 (peaceful adjustment of any situation) "are not yet sufficiently well developed so that peaceful change is a well-ordered function of the Assembly."

We may ask why would states rather have a political decision on a legal question, than a legal decision? I take it the fundamental reason may be that they feel that the chances are better to get at least something out of a political compromise or maneuver, whereas, especially if their case is weak, they might get nothing out of a legal decision on the merits.

CONSIDER ITS MEMBERSHIP

(2) How is the United Nations constituted?

The 81 members are said to represent the opinion, the conscience and the aspirations of the world community. It is a cross-section of the races and peoples of the world with their native prejudices and biases, their civilizations and cultures, their religious and moral levels, their totalitarian and democratic systems, their antagonisms and affinities, their hopes and fears. It also harbors the evils of all political bodies—political maneuvers, log-rolling, pressure groups, special interests, et cetera.

Moreover, the Assembly of the United Nations is a body so constituted that 5 percent of the world's population can outvote the other 95 percent; half of the population of the world is represented by 4 delegates, the other half by 75 delegates.

The Asian-African-Soviet bloc comprises more than a third of the membership of 81 nations and so could, if it stood together, block any major effort of the Assembly where a two-thirds vote is required, as under the Uniting for Peace Resolution of 1950, when the Security Council is stalled by a veto, unless some moderates could be won over by cajoling or pressuring.

Should a nation abdicate its constitutional right to formulate its own foreign policy and follow that to be formulated by a body so constituted? Can it be said that the Asian-African-Soviet members, with a controlling voice in the Assembly, are trustworthy and responsible in world affairs, that is, put the principles of the charter, the community interest, before national and racial interests?

A recent example of ineffective United Nations action due to the makeup of the Assembly was the second resolution on the withdrawal of forces from Egypt.

In order to overcome the imbalance of Asian-African-Soviet votes, the second resolution had to be watered down to very dilute language susceptible to different interpretations to suit everybody. Moreover, the political issues were very complicated and very difficult to state in the form of a resolution which is the way the Assembly renders a decision.

The resolution is drafted by a delegation or group of delegations so as to draw enough votes to carry it. This as we have seen leads to equivocation and vague phraseology. Such a procedure does not tend to promote full and complete justice particularly since each delegation votes according to the selfish interests of its government on pain of repudiation at home.

Robert Murphy, Deputy Under Secretary of State, recognized this situation in his speech of March 9 last:

"Thus when we work in an organization like the United Nations which includes a membership of 80 nations and where conflict of interest is frequently the rule, a solution of a given problem which seems perhaps logical and theoretically right may be practically impossible. The application of the principle of equal justice for all nations, large as well as small, is easy in the saying, but more difficult in the achievement. We do not live in a world of flat, but one where the resolution of conflicts of interest requires ingenuity and tolerance.

BIAS IN VIEWS INEVITABLE

(3) Other attributes of the United Nations.

A reading of the debates of the Assembly shows how widely biased are the national views on almost every subject. For example, the former colonial countries and some others are strong for self-determination for any discontented people. According to Premier Mollet, the Communists promote national fronts in black Africa and inflame fanatical nationalism among colored peoples not yet able to read or write, let alone run a government. Their impoverished society is rich prey for dictatorship.

Some discontented people, especially the lately colonial peoples, are led to think that denying self-determination is a form of denial of justice. Does this indicate that justice cannot be had in the world, unless any national group is free to exercise self-determination at any time and split away from suam patriam, no matter how long it may have been a part thereof—over 100 years in the case of Algeria, I believe. Witness the recent appeal of Brittany to the United Nations for freedom from French domination.

Has a government no authority to put down a political rebellion within its own territory? If not, our Civil War, which preserved the Union, was wrong then and would be wrong now if it occurred today.

Moreover, the decisions of the General Assembly are not binding on member states in the same sense as the decisions of the Security Council. The General Assembly is not, in the words of Ambassador Lodge, "a super state which passes resolutions having the force of law." They are merely "hortatory and recommendatory." It cannot dictate to the states on matters recognized as essentially sovereign. Then by what authority did the Assembly assume to call back the advancing forces, the sovereign arms, of Britain, France, and Israel? Our eminent international lawyer, Julius Stone, of Harvard, put this question in a letter to the New York Times, February 8, 1957.

The votes of delegations in the Assembly are apt to be warped by alliances, by fear of offending a powerful neighbor (Finland and Iceland, for example) by grants of military or financial aid or by special treaty arrange-

ments. Nehru recently said it was "quite possible" the Security Council action calling for a plebiscite in Kashmir "is due to these military alliances."

Moreover, the United Nations itself is organized on a discriminatory basis in favor of the permanent members of the Council, in that they have the right of veto. They are thus immune from any untoward action of the Council while other nations are not so immune. This is not true in the Assembly, but its decisions are only recommendatory.

INITIATIVE RESTS WITH MEMBERS

(4) It should be understood that the United Nations has no initiative of its own. It is, and does, what the member nations agree upon in specific cases. The initiative is theirs alone. It becomes merged in a collective decision.

Can a nation wisely say that its foreign policy will follow the United Nations whose policy is the result of such agreement among members as debate and compromise may secure?

A nation must take the initiative and while making its own foreign policy tally with the guiding principles of the charter, seek to convince the United Nations to use the procedures that will make it effective. It cannot wisely reverse the process—forego its initiative and follow the policy made by the Assembly. For the Assembly is not constituted to render a political decision based on its merits but rather a decision of expediency that will best serve the special interests of the members or groups of members.

This is illustrated in the Suez case. Israel declined to comply with the United Nations resolution to withdraw her forces from certain parts of Egypt, except upon certain guaranties. President Eisenhower declared the United Nations had no choice but to exert pressure upon Israel to comply with the United Nations resolution, unconditionally. The Arab-Asian bloc, which would like to push Israel into the sea, stood ready to propose sanctions to force her withdrawal, knowing that severe sanctions would cripple her.

The evident unfairness and discrimination of such action against Israel while other offenders against the United Nations demands, such as the Soviet Union and Egypt, went free, aroused so much adverse public opinion in the United States and abroad that renewed efforts to avoid sanctions against Israel were undertaken. These efforts consisted in bringing moral pressure to bear on Israel to comply with the United Nations resolution. This induced Israel to build up certain "assumptions and expectations" as to future action by the United Nations and the United States which were like the biblical house built upon the sand. This shows how a country has to try to initiate and press its own policy in the United Nations and not to take a laissez faire attitude.

JUSTICE MUST BE IMPARTIAL

(5) What does a just settlement of a political problem entail?

A just settlement would have to take into consideration all the states which would be substantially affected by the settlement, not those which will be only remotely affected. Besides, the interest should be a peaceful one, not a predatory one nor one to settle old grudges.

In this regard it is interesting to note what President Eisenhower said in connection with Israel's interest in the Middle East settlement:

"I would hope no one would believe that the United States in all of these conferences that take place in what we call the final settlement of basic troubles in the region, is not trying to protect and assure the rights of all in every respect and is not trying merely to get some formula that will just stop fighting for the moment. The whole gamut of complaints must be looked at, studied and

they must be satisfied, if we are going to have permanent peace and the United States is interested in that."

Along the same line, Dag Hammarskjöld, in his report to the General Assembly February 12, 1957, on the Egypt-Israel controversy, said:

"Peaceful conditions in the Middle East must be created in the interest of all countries in the region and of the world community."

Not only should the settlement take care of the interests of affected states but the settlement for obvious reasons should not represent a judgment by the affected states in their own interest, that is, a judgment by the parties most interested. A state should not act as a judge in its own cause, so said the world court in the Mosul case and the Iraq-Turkey frontier case. This well-known rule seems to be accepted in the Security Council but not in the Assembly.

Nothing disintegrates confidence like a decision riddled with selfish interests.

The decision at the Paris peace conference to give the South Tyrol to Italy is a classic example of a wrong political decision by interested states, victors in World War I. A modern example of political decision by interested powers without minding the interests of others, was the establishment of Israel by the United Nations out of territory mostly owned or claimed by Arab peoples. There has been trouble ever since.

Perhaps the basic principle of justice is the same treatment for all. "Justice is impartial," said the court in the Betsey case (4 International Adjudications 187); that is to say, the same standards for large and small states with no discrimination. The equality of nations requires this. Consequently, nations flouting the directions of the United Nations should be treated alike.

In the Suez case Egypt ignored the demand of the Security Council in 1951 in respect of the blockade of Israel, but the United Nations took no steps to enforce its demands. Last summer when Egypt seized the canal, the Canal Co., and the concession, and breached the treaty of 1888, all this elicited no response from the United Nations. "It was the failure to enforce the law against Egypt that set the armies marching."

The whole Suez episode bristles with legal questions, but not one has so far been laid before the World Court. The United Nations seems more interested in restoring a semblance of peace by cease-fire (while leaving the seeds of war) than working out justice impartially. For example, when Israel, after her invasion, refused to withdraw her troops from Gaza and the mouth of Aqaba Gulf except on certain conditions, a large number, perhaps a majority of members, including the Soviet-Asian-African bloc, were inclined to impose sanctions on Israel to force her withdrawal without conditions. Would this attitude produce even-handed justice?

On the other hand, when India rejected four resolutions of the Security Council calling for a plebiscite in Kashmir and boldly annexed Kashmir instead, the United Nations, so far, has taken no steps to enforce the resolutions.

Again, Russia ignored the United Nations resolutions to withdraw from Hungary, calling the incident a domestic one, and no disciplinary steps were taken by the United Nations except to condemn her action. Such action or nonaction, impugning such violations, is contrary to the rudiments of fair dealing by any game of right. I lay the cause of such one-sided action to the factors inherent in the makeup of the Assembly, as reviewed above, which makes it unfitted to act as a political tribunal to dispense justice.

In other words, the United Nations contains members who do not abide by the rules, at home or abroad, that they would apply to others. And this is due, in the case

of the great powers, not only to the privileged position which they occupy in the organization, but to the vast difference in their interests and moral levels which their privileged position allows them to exploit.

Hence, the United Nations is not an institution, even with the best of intentions of many members, that can be relied on to reach just political decisions. We have here a body subject to the control of other factors than the principles of law and justice.

HOW TO PROVIDE FOR PEACEFUL CHANGE

(6) We come, at length, to inevitable changes in the relationships of nations. The community of nations is a growing changing organism. The status quo has to give way to these changes of growth. Such changes give rise to some of the most difficult imponderables of international life. Our Secretary of State has written forcefully on the subject of "Peaceful Change," and Under Secretary Hoover last November stated the problem before the General Assembly as follows:

"In seeking peace and justice it [the United Nations] must find means of providing for peaceful change.

"The United Nations must assist legitimate changes to take place but it must also strive to prevent these changes from shattering the peace or from harming the legitimate interests of others. * * * It is the task of statesmanship to guide changes into channels which are both peaceful and just. In striving to reconcile conflicting claims and interests we may sometimes make progress slowly. We must not become discouraged when for the time being the best we can achieve is a truce or an armistice. We must look at our problems with a sense of the possible and a determination to find it."

This statement raises many questions involved in the problem of peaceful change. What are legitimate changes? What are legitimate interests of others to be protected? How to reconcile conflicting claims and interests?

How will the United Nations find means of providing for peaceful change? There are a number of such changes pending or in the offing—Cyprus, Goa, Algeria, West New Guinea, British Honduras, to mention a few.

Is the United Nations conditioned to do justice in deciding these questions? For the reasons already given, it is believed it is not qualified to render the dispassionate judgment necessary in such complicated cases involving both law and policy.

The United Nations cannot, as we have seen, impose a permanent solution. Nor can force be used according to the charter. Therefore, to be satisfactory, peaceful change must be the result of negotiation. Existing arrangements are often based on treaties and the United Nations has not been given competence to deal directly or indirectly with the revision of treaties. If a treaty is involved, the aggravated party should be able to ask the World Court to render an opinion on whether the treaty has ceased to be binding on the ground of *rebus sic stantibus* or any other ground. A treaty that is merely onerous would be ripe for negotiation. In this the Secretary General may be helpful as a disinterested mediator. As the defendant country is the party to be dismembered, it will naturally regard such a course as interference in her affairs and take a recalcitrant attitude. A political court (as proposed below) might help in this respect as a disinterested adjunct to finding an unbiased solution.

NEW STATES CHANGE BALANCE

(7) Finally, a disquieting change in the structure of the Assembly is already clouding the horizon. I refer to the new states recently admitted to the United Nations and to those to be admitted in the future. A number of them will come from the vast

continents of Asia and Africa as the colonial empires break up into independent nations which join the United Nations, like the new Negro state of Ghana.

It is probable that these splinter states, weak in government experience, economic stability, and military defense, will be prime targets for Communist subversion. Each will have a vote equal to that of the United States and the other powers.

This influx of new states from Asia and Africa must inevitably soften, by a sort of self-mutilation, the hard core of western civilization and culture represented in the Assembly. This has been the source of a most important factor; namely, western ideals of administration, law, and justice—a habit of peaceful ways of settlement according to acceptable moral standards—without this ballast the Assembly would have been unable to ride out the crises of the last decade and may not be able to meet those of the future. This is to me the most frightening prospect, already well advanced, to come about in the composition of the Assembly. It would change the usefulness of the United Nations and the history of the world. Already 19 newly sovereign states have come into existence since the charter came into force. The purpose of the Soviets to gain control of the Assembly is emerging and well advanced. In his address of March 19, 1957, Assistant Secretary Wilcox emphasized this problem, as follows:

"A United Nations that has grown in less than 2 years from 60 to 81 members and in which the Afro-Asian states now constitute more than a third of the total presents new problems and, I think, new opportunities. I do not think that it is necessarily cause for alarm.

"Those who are concerned point to the fact that the General Assembly rather than the Security Council has become the voice of the United Nations and its most influential body. The relative strength of the Latin American States has been reduced. The conflict over so-called colonial problems has been sharpened. With the recent increase in membership the Afro-Asian nations alone, if they stood together, could no doubt prevent the passage of any important resolution. * * *

"On certain fundamental issues the Afro-Asian nations do stand very solidly together. I refer particularly to colonialism and economic development. On these they are often joined by the so-called Latin American bloc.

"In my opinion, what is required of United Nations members in the enlarged General Assembly—where each state has one vote—is a special sense of responsibility. The smaller and undeveloped countries do have a collective power far out of proportion to their economic, military, and political strength. If they abuse this power, the General Assembly can become a center of contention and deadlock. On the other hand, the great powers, if their cause is just, should not lack the support of the majority of the General Assembly on important issues."

The intransigence of Colonel Nasser in negotiations with the Secretary General and the United States is apparently due to his feeling that the West has no weapons with which to force him to make concessions. He feels protected from Security Council action by the Soviet veto and from Assembly action by the Soviet-Asian-African bloc which holds over one-third of the votes. This fact may also prevent a request for an advisory opinion of the World Court. A few more Communist votes added to the United Nations would throw the control of the United Nations over to our enemies. Suppose Red China were admitted as a veto member.

SUGGESTS A STANDING PANEL

(8) Please do not misunderstand me. I have nothing but the greatest admiration for

the achievements attained under the League Covenant and the charter. I hate to think of the world pressures without the safety valve of the United Nations. It seems, however, that the political field where immense unsettled problems lie deadlocked today and where the future problems may stagnate tomorrow—this field needs additional machinery to promote solutions. The rise and spread of police states and underdeveloped states in the United Nations will produce an alarming situation in the functioning of the United Nations.

What is the remedy? Secretary Dulles has suggested the revision of the voting procedure so that single states will have a number of votes in proportion to their power and population. Professor Sohn of Harvard and others have worked out tables of weighted votes (Sohn, *World Law*, p. 320 ff.). Weighted votes are in use in the International Bank.

For my part, I suggest another possible remedy; namely, the establishment of a special political commission or tribunal of disinterested men to consider political matters only. It could be established by a resolution of the Assembly as was the International Law Commission and be constituted on the general lines of that Commission.

I suggest it be composed of 15 members learned and experienced in international politics and international law and entirely independent of the policies and control of their governments so that they would be in a position to consider impartially any political question submitted to them and to render an unbiased dispassionate report thereon for the use of the Assembly or Security Council. Its duties would be entirely advisory but it could recommend a settlement which it deemed just and proper. Its duties would not bar a binding decision if the interested parties agreed thereto. It would thus be an adjunct to the political organs of the United Nations to assist them in the investigation and settlement of political problems on the basis of a disinterested finding.

Such a body would add to the moral authority of a United Nations decision. It would be in the nature of a standing Commission of Inquiry for political matters attached to and forming a part of the charter machinery. It would function something like the Aaland Islands Commission although this was a commission of jurists. I greatly respect the commission's handling of that case, with which I was in a humble way connected.

There are no principles to guide the decision of political questions that I know of, but we may confidently expect that repeated decisions by a political tribunal might develop such principles or a set of equitable precedents to form a body of common or unwritten law. The Organization of American States has made progress in this field.

The United Nations was based on the assumption that it offered sufficient alternatives to use of force. When this assumption fails what is to be done?

My purpose is to offer a further alternative to the use or threat of force when the charter machinery becomes bogged down. Can it be expected that force will be renounced in that situation and the problem left to fester in the world body politic indefinitely?

I have not gone into the details of organization as I wished to present the general idea of a disinterested commission devoted to political questions alone and without administrative functions. There are many precedents to be drawn upon for details.

CORRECTION OF JUDICIAL ERRORS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I commend the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee for their action in considering the problems presented by

certain recent Supreme Court decisions, and for the courageous steps which have been taken to overcome the legal effects of what many of us believe to be serious aberrations in the law. I understand that the bill (S. 2646) was ordered reported favorably by the full committee this morning. I think that every person seriously concerned with matters of constitutional government will be most interested in the details of their report.

I understand the report will actually be filed as soon as there has been time for the preparation of the minority views.

It is unfortunate that while so many problems are clamoring for the attention of the legislative branch, so much of our time and energy should be consumed in what many of us believe to be an absolutely necessary correction of judicial errors which will otherwise haunt us for years to come. It has long been my belief that the most effective conservative influence in our Government is the United States Senate, and that often we are called upon to take an unpopular stand in order to preserve constitutional checks and balances when the clamor for change and innovation becomes hysterical.

The action by the committee now puts the problem squarely up to the Senate, where I urge that it receive both early and favorable consideration.

We must give our serious attention to the grave issues now confronting us in these vital fields.

THE OUTDOOR JEFFERSONIAN

EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE RELATIONS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, early in this Congress I introduced Senate bill 2693 to repeal the National Labor Relations Act and return to the States the traditional right of control in this field.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "The Outdoor Jeffersonian," written by special writer Holmes Alexander.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OUTDOOR JEFFERSONIAN

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, a boilermaker's helper and a \$4-a-day goldminer in his day, has been nearly 12 years in the Upper Chamber without voting in favor of a labor law.

My own opinion is that this burly hard-handed outdoor man who spent his early years in railroad, mining, and construction camps and whose saddle-strewn office looks like a cowboy's tackroom, has got a soft spot for the working stiffs who belong to unions.

But I have never been able to make MALONE admit this sentimental attachment. Any approach to the subject soon leads into his gravel-voiced denunciation of internationalism, free trade, foreign aid—in fact, almost everything that goes in this town by the name "liberal." Nevada's senior Senator is against all that is New Dealish and Modern Republican—except labor. This you might say is a Right Wing Republican's one wild out of liberalism. But is it?

Perhaps, a more accurate way to look at it is that MALONE's labor policy is the acme of all that is conservative in American politics. He has a bill (S. 2693) which would repeal the Taft-Hartley Act (against which MALONE

voted in 1947 despite Senator Taft's fervid personal pleading) and abolish all its cumbersome machinery. In place of Taft-Hartley, Malone would substitute a system that is positively classical in its simplicity.

There would be a Federal Conciliation Service in charge of a single \$15,000 a year director with duties to be bounded by the Jeffersonian principle: "Least governed; best governed." In fact, it's doubtful if any Federal agent since the third presidency ever had such hands-off instructions as this proposed director of FCS. He would be ordered to—

"1. To prevent or minimize interruptions of the free flow of commerce * * * through conciliation and mediation. * * *

"2. To avoid attempting to mediate disputes that would have only a minor effect on interstate commerce. * * *

"3. To make (his) conciliation and mediation services available * * * only as a last resort and in exceptional cases."

This looks to me like a model for labor legislation, and for all other legislation that brings Federal interference into the States and into communities of business, commerce, and industry. It's MALONE's theory that both the Wagner and Taft-Hartley Acts were postulated on the absurdity that a regulatory board, based in the District of Columbia, has some special insight into local conditions outside of Washington. Jefferson himself could find little fault with this Old Guard Republican's assertions that—

1. The people in America are self-ruled. In MALONE's terms, expressed in the Senate, July 26, 1947, and still unrevised: "Public sentiment will finally settle a dispute in a community. But when we are 3,000 miles away from the scene of the work, no public sentiment can take place. We have a fine body of men here, but not one of us, unless he lives in Nevada, has any more idea of what a miner at work does in Ely, Nev., than a hog has about holy water."

2. The police power properly belongs to the locality. As MALONE told the lawmaking 80th Congress more than a decade past: "Mr. President, there is no police power in any city within the Union but the policeman on the corner. There is no power in the county but the sheriff and his deputies. * * * It is just as much against the law to hit a man over the head with a pick handle when he attempts to go through a picket line peaceably as to hit a Senator over the head with a pick handle as he goes out this door. * * * When we enact a law which provides that the National Labor Relations Board in Washington, D. C., shall settle every dispute in the country * * * we are placing upon the NLRB a duty which it is impossible for it to fulfill."

Much water has run under the bridge since the Senator's remarks originated. But they seem to make pertinent comment upon events of this Congressional session: the hearings on the Kohler and Perfect Circle strikes, the continuing liberation struggle by union members against their bosses, the inclination of three to four dozen Senators to duck any disagreement with the same labor bosses and—finally—the looming certainty that this Congress is being forced by popular demand to consider some Taft-Hartley amendments before it goes home for the election campaigns.

Well, for its virtue of simplicity and its back-to-the-people philosophy, the Malone labor bill wouldn't be the worst thing that Congress could pass.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have witnessed 12 years of conflict between employees and employers on the Senate floor.

There would appear to be a deliberate attempt to keep the feud alive.

The advent of the National Labor Relations Board—an innocent bystander in

the major fight—through the Wagner Act as amended by the Taft-Hartley Act, was the real beginning of a feud which can only be resolved by a return to the States of their traditional responsibility in this field.

THE STATUS OF DR. J. ROBERT OPPENHEIMER

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in a recent editorial the Bend Bulletin, published by Mr. Robert W. Chandler, in Bend, Oreg., raised the disturbing question of the present status of one of our Nation's most eminent scientists, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer. The editorial stated that the talents of an outstanding physicist such as Dr. Oppenheimer are too valuable to be effectively lost to the Nation by denying him security clearance because of past unwise friendships and personal associations. When our Government makes a fetish of keeping scientific secrets from such scientists, have we not reached the point where security becomes ridiculous and self-defeating?

It seems to me to be an easy but highly significant error to assume that a denial of security clearance is a sort of penalty, or, at least, a serious loss, to the scientist concerned. Actually, of course, the loss is ours, not his. Dr. Oppenheimer is the head of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, N. J. What he does there may be more rewarding and more interesting to him than working on Government research projects. Certainly we cannot simply assume the arrogant premise that every good scientist yearns to have access to Government research, and that it is his loss when he is denied the necessary clearance.

The opposite may be true. I know nothing personally of Dr. Oppenheimer's attitude, but the case was clearly presented in testimony before the Disarmament Subcommittee by a young Columbia University nuclear physicist, Dr. Jay Orear.

Dr. Orear testified to facts concerning nuclear weapons which the preceding witness, the eminent Dr. Edward Teller, had declined to reveal on the ground of security classification. When questioned further, Dr. Orear explained that he could give this information because he had no security clearance for access to classified secrets; that, therefore, nothing he knew and said of his own knowledge could be the unauthorized disclosure of such classified secrets. For that reason, he said, he would prefer not to have a security clearance; he wished to be able to continue to discuss publicly the results of his own research and his knowledge of other facts known to science outside of the secret world of Government science.

Mr. President, I think this episode illustrates some of the absurdities inherent in the Nation of secret science, and in denying security clearance to such physicists as Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer. I ask unanimous consent that the vigorous and forthright editorial on this subject, published in the Bend Bulletin of April 18, 1958, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin of April 18, 1958]

HOW ABOUT OPPENHEIMER?

Klaus Fuchs, the British scientist who gave the Russians the secret of the A-bomb and who went to prison for his crime, is about to be released.

The British Government is making a strong effort to keep Fuchs in that country, and is planning to put him back to work on nuclear research, where Fuchs admittedly is an outstanding man.

In view of the attitude of the British toward Fuchs, it's time for the United States to take another look at the Oppenheimer case.

J. Robert Oppenheimer is an outstanding American scientist. He never stole anything. He never gave secrets to anyone. But his security clearance was lifted because he had made some extremely poor choices of friends.

Oppenheimer undoubtedly has learned as much from his problems as Fuchs learned from his prison stay.

This country needs Oppenheimer as much as the British need Fuchs.

ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF CHARLES MARION RUSSELL TO BE PLACED IN STATUARY HALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1491, Senate Concurrent Resolution 80.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res 80) accepting the statue of Charles Marion Russell, presented by the State of Montana, to be placed in Statuary Hall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

EFFECTS OF MORTGAGE AND HOUSING ACT OF 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, today the Federal National Mortgage Association has issued a report, as it has done each week since the President signed the housing bill which was passed in March, giving the progress of the program under that law.

The bill was signed on April 1. At the end of the first 3 weeks of operation under that law, the Federal National Mortgage Association has announced that it has entered into commitment contracts totaling \$63,181,000 for the purchase of 5,389 Government-backed mortgages, covering the low- and moderate-priced housing under the special assistance program established by the Mortgage and Housing Act of 1958.

At or about the time the bill was signed by the President, we heard and read many statements which doubted that the program would be worth while.

But I think the fact that more than 5,000 houses have been made possible in the first 3 weeks of April, to the extent

of in excess of \$63 million worth, bears out the statement which I and many other Senators made at the time, namely, that if the bill were enacted into law, it would start housing very soon and would put people to work.

Mr. President, about the time when the bill became law, the Wall Street Journal published a very extensive article which dealt with the prospects under the bill. The Wall Street Journal made a rather discouraging report.

On Monday of this week, the Wall Street Journal published a front-page article entitled "Housing Upturn?" In the article there appears a discussion of the progress made under this program. In the article the point is made that only 3 weeks before, the Wall Street Journal made a survey from which it appeared that not much would be accomplished by the program.

The article is very interesting, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, the article from the Wall Street Journal, the notice from the Federal National Mortgage Association, and a table I have prepared, which shows this matter in summary form.

There being no objection, the article, notice, and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 23, 1958]

HOUSING UPTURN?—BUILDERS RAISE SIGHTS AS RESULT OF NEW LOAN RULES, EASIER CREDIT—SOME SAY VA REVIVAL SPURS FLURRY OF BUYING—LENDERS SCRAMBLE FOR MORTGAGES—BIG GAINER: LOW-COST HOMES

Many homebuilders are jacking up the number of houses they plan to hammer together this year—a sign, perhaps, that the long-awaited housing upturn may be on the way.

Sparkling the upturn in construction plans is a mixture of easier mortgage money, effects of the new Federal anti-recession housing act and sunnier weather. That's the word from a majority of some 100 builders interviewed by Wall Street Journal reporters in a score of cities. A like number of mortgage lenders, although less optimistic than most builders, generally agree that they, too, are feeling a pickup in housing activity.

Although the Government's emergency housing act became law, only 3 weeks ago, many builders say this, plus a subsequent administration move ending downpayments on Veterans Administration-insured mortgages, already is hypoing housing sales and starts. Just a month ago a Wall Street Journal survey found the mercurial homebuilding industry generally pessimistic about probable effects of the bill, although its Congressional backers claimed it would add 200,000 homes to this year's building total.

REVIVING VA LOAN PROGRAM

The housing act aims at encouraging home buying by: Reviving the once-sagging VA home loan program by making so-called GI loans more attractive to lenders; easing terms on Federal Housing Administration-insured mortgages; making available \$1,850,000,000 to back home loans, and other measures.

"Passage of the housing bill made me double the estimate of the number of homes we plan to build this year (from 75 to 150)," says an official at Douglas Lowell, Inc., a Portland, Oreg., homebuilder. "Up to now, I've had to tell people they couldn't qualify for a loan before I even showed the house. Since the bill went through I'm getting dozens of calls from these people asking if

they can qualify now. With the lower downpayment requirements, I figure that at least 60 percent to 70 percent now can buy."

Across the Nation at Jacksonville, Walter Cowart, president of a building firm bearing his name, says: "I've been shooting for 150 houses this year, but with the housing law I figure I may go to 200. I think dropping the downpayment on VA housing is going to help materially. Veterans will come back into the market. I haven't had any VA sales in a year and a half but recently I've filed several VA applications."

And in recession-ridden Detroit, Sheldon Rose, president of Edward Rose & Sons, Inc., happily reports: "Our sales in the past 2 weeks have been 30 percent higher than they would have been if the bill hadn't been passed." As a result, he says, his company may build more than 500 houses this year, compared with earlier plans to put up only 350.

PUBLICITY HELPING US

To many builders, the publicity attending recent Federal housing actions has been as important as the actions themselves. "The good publicity we're getting now definitely is helping us," says Nicholas Stevens, vice president of Manor Building Co. in Philadelphia. "Our sales—10 houses—picked up about 500 percent last week over the previous 2 weeks," he adds.

Builders and lenders report other significant changes on the housing front. Some highlights:

A step-up in the supply of mortgage money has tended to lower interest rates and extend terms on conventional (non-Government-backed) mortgages. Increased competition for good mortgage investments has spurred many lenders actively to seek loans and to launch promotional drives. The increased VA maximum interest rate, to 4½ percent from 4½ percent, is bringing many lenders into the GI mortgage market, for the first time in over a year, in many cases. And many builders are switching to erecting low-cost homes instead of more expensive models, because new housing regulations have their biggest effect on the less costly units.

If the upturn in builders' plans is translated into a surge of housing starts this month—and many contractors indicate they're losing no time in boosting starts—the effect could reach beyond the construction industry itself. Increased building could help trim unemployment, for one thing; supporters of the housing act think it might provide jobs for 500,000 workers.

IMPACT ON SLUMP ACTIONS?

Moreover, a sizable upswing in April housing starts might stem further Federal anti-recession actions. Government officials have been keeping a wary eye on housing figures as one gauge of the recession's depth and duration. "There's trouble," Government economists said recently, "if the annual housing rate in April doesn't jump above the March seasonally adjusted annual rate of 880,000 units, a 9-year low." Figures on this month's starts won't be available until mid-May.

Private nonfarm housing starts last year dropped below 1 million for the first time since 1949, totaling 991,000. That compared with 1,094,000 in 1956 and with the record 1,352,000 units of 1950. Until this month, poor weather has hampered building activity in much of the Nation. With better weather and the impetus of the new housing regulations, Albert Cole, Federal Housing Administrator, predicts 1,100,000 new homes will be built this year.

Several builders eagerly cited specific sales made on the strength of new Federal housing spurs.

"I just sold a \$13,500 new home to a veteran for no money down on a 30-year mortgage," asserts Leo P. Haffard, a Portland, Oreg., home builder. "I sure felt good when

the mortgage company phoned and told me they had cleared him for the loan. This guy makes over \$5,000 a year and could handle payments of over \$100 a month, but had no money saved up, so before the housing bill was passed, he just could not move in. I'm expecting a lot of this kind of business this year so I've planned on building about 50 percent more homes than originally scheduled."

BOOST FOR DALLAS BUYERS

Mahaffey-Wagner Construction Co. in Dallas says liberalized housing regulations were mainly responsible for boosting sales to 22 houses during the first 3 weeks this month, only 7 short of the total units sold during February and March. Twenty of the houses bought this month were on GI loans. "Seventy percent of the VA buyers told us they probably wouldn't have bought this soon if down payments hadn't been taken off," says Alden Wagner, partner in the firm. The company now intends to build 150 homes this year, up 25 percent from an earlier estimate.

Many builders report they are chalking up sales gains mainly as a result of the easing in mortgage money.

The mortgage money picture is "tremendously improved," says Anthony Tambone, head of Massachusetts Builders, Inc., in Reading, Mass. He had nine \$17,000 houses standing unsold since last September. He sold all nine within a week after his bank called to tell him it would take GI loans at 4 1/4 percent, 30-year terms and no down payment.

"I just went through my files of old prospects and found any number who couldn't meet bank requirements before but can meet the new terms," Mr. Tambone explains.

"I've only built a handful of GI and FHA houses in the past 2 years, but the loosening in terms has changed my plans," says M. L. Bailey, president of Houston's Northwest Builders, Inc., which expects to sell 100 houses this year, up from 25 in 1957.

LOAN APPLICATIONS SOAR

The effects of easier credit have been spectacular in the Houston area, as in many other cities. The number of F. H. A. loan applications on new homes in a 37-county area of southeast Texas for the quarter ended March 31 soared 76 percent to 1,193, compared with the like period in 1957. And the year-to-year increase has shown no signs of slackening this month.

In the Houston suburb of Sharpstown, builders report record crowds and high interest among the potential homebuyers now traipsing through 32 new \$15,000 to \$20,000 houses in the homebuilders' annual Parade of Homes. Says Gordon Neilson, executive vice president of the local homebuilders' association: "We're looking for starts of about 10,000 in 1958." That would be about 20 percent above Houston's last year's total.

Nationally, FHA applications in March covered nearly 25,000 new dwelling units, up from 20,600 in February and 16,200 in March 1957.

But even more spectacular gains are being made in the recently moribund VA home-loan program, which until a few weeks ago was scheduled to end this July. A special VA report shows appraisal requests (which precede applications for mortgage guarantees) totaled 11,067 through April 15, or 2,661 more than for all of March. Last December, applications had fallen to 3,500.

Noting the brisk pace in GI loan applications for early April, Sumner G. Whittier, VA administrator, predicts: "If the same rate is maintained during the last half of this month it will account for more than 22,000 proposed GI homes, an increase of 163 percent over March." Dropping of the 2-percent downpayment rule has given the VA program its biggest push, say most builders.

"The same thing is taking place that happened when down payments were removed from GI loans in 1954, declares John F. Austin, Jr., president of T. J. Bettes Co., a big Houston mortgage-servicing firm. "Many builders are switching back to FHA and GI loans to attract buyers. When they did this in 1954, home starts for the next year or so took a big jump.

Robin Hill Homes on Long Island is one such builder now switching back to VA-backed financing for the first time in a year and a half. Since early 1957, banks wouldn't take the GI loans, explains Alexander Paulsen, a partner in the concern. "They forced us to cut out VA financing when they boosted discounts to six points or more," he says. Now he's paying discounts of only about two points, and plans to build 350 homes this year, up from 250 last year.

Discounts are a result of the fixed maximum rates on VA and FHA mortgages. Because they were able to earn more on other investments, lenders for some time were especially unwilling to make VA loans at the old maximum rate of 4 1/2 percent. To place VA loans, builders had to agree to discounts. If, for example, a builder offers a \$10,000 mortgage to a lender, the lender may agree to pay only \$9,500 for it. That's a discount of 5 percent. Since the lender will collect the full \$10,000—plus interest—over the life of the mortgage, his actual return will be considerably higher than 4 1/2 percent.

Now, with more plentiful supplies of mortgage money available, and with the increase in the VA interest ceiling to 4 1/4 percent, lenders generally have trimmed discounts. San Francisco lenders generally agree that the quarter point VA interest hike is worth two discount points to builders. And, they say, there's no shortage of money.

MILLIONS TO INVEST

"There's an awful lot of money in the mortgage market right now—everybody has millions to invest," remarks D. Clair Sutherland, a vice president at San Francisco's Bank of America. As a result, interest rates on conventional rates have been falling, terms are being lengthened and competition for home loans is waxing hotter than it has for years.

For prime mortgages, says Mr. Sutherland, 5 1/2 percent is the going rate for conventional loans in the Golden Gate area, while 6 months ago it was a firm 6 percent.

In Jacksonville, William J. Rivers, associate general manager of Prudential Insurance Co.'s south-central home office, covering a 10-State area, says: "In the past 6 months we've all had to come down a little in our sights, from one-fourth to one-half a point. Where you were getting 6 percent you're down to 5 3/4 percent and where you were at 5 1/2 percent you're at 5 1/4 percent. We hear rumors some of our competitors are quoting at 5 1/4 percent; we're sticking to 5 1/2 percent for the time being."

The Boston Five Cent Savings Bank early this month chopped interest rates on conventional mortgages from 5 percent to 4 1/4 percent. "We were getting 5 or 6 mortgage applications a day but since we reduced the rate and started taking GI loans again we have been getting 25 or so applications a day," says a bank official.

Frank Flynn, vice president of National Homes Corp., a large builder of prefabricated homes in Lafayette, Ind., says mortgage money has become so readily available that investors are seeking him out nearly every day. "I just had a call from a Massachusetts savings bank offering money with a discount of only four points. Six months ago we would have had to pay almost triple that amount for this type of mortgage money," he asserts.

Another builder who's being solicited every day by eager lenders is Chicago's

L. & H. Builders, Inc. "It's becoming a pain in the neck," sighs Quinn Hogan, the company's president. "I couldn't find any of these guys 4 years ago when I needed them." Observes Mr. Paulsen of Long Island's Robin Hill Homes: "I didn't know a lending institution not hustling for business. Two months ago they were sitting on their hands."

Lending institutions provide plenty of evidence of such hustling. "We're out beating the bushes for good mortgage investments," says Arthur Cannon, vice president and treasurer of Standard Insurance Co. in Portland. "One way we're doing this is the transferring of much of the decisionmaking to our field offices. If our field representative can tell an applicant on the spot whether he can qualify for a loan, it really speeds up service and makes the applicant happy."

"Before," says Joseph J. Braceland, vice president of the Philadelphia Saving Fund Society, "we just sat back and waited for mortgages to come to us. Now we have men on the street telling folks that we have money to lend."

Larry Seeman, president of Mortgage Syndicates, Inc., in St. Louis, says: "You don't pick and choose as much as you did" to find suitable mortgage investments. "There's a lot more competition." To meet competition, some banks and savings and loan associations are switching advertising campaigns from savings to loans.

FREE SHORT-TERM LOANS

National Homes' Mr. Flynn reports that "in Ohio, some savings and loans are giving builders 60-day construction loans free if the builders will do their (mortgage) financing with them."

Many lenders already have lengthened mortgage terms and several are pondering such a move. "We are going to 20 years, compared with a 15-year limit 3 months ago," says the loan officer of a Cleveland savings and loan association. A Dallas mortgage investment company says about 30 percent of its conventional home loans now are for 25 years, as against about 5 percent which extended any longer than 20 years about 6 months ago.

"Conservative lenders who had stuck right on 20 years now offer 25 years without even being asked," comments Charles Ekliit, president of Beneficial Savings & Loan in Oakland, Calif.

Most builders revising construction plans upwards also report they are switching heavily to lower cost models, a market which, they believe, will benefit most from liberalized housing rules and easier credit.

Jacksonville's Cowart Bros. normally has built houses ranging up to \$18,000. Now the firm intends to concentrate on those in the \$10,000 to \$13,500 bracket. One reason is lowering of the minimum downpayment on FHA-insured mortgages to 3 percent on the first \$13,500 (from 3 percent on the first \$10,000 and 15 percent on the next \$6,000). Also, the minimum 2-percent downpayment has been dropped on home mortgages guaranteed under the FHA program; VA loans chiefly cover lower-priced homes.

Mr. Cowart supplies another reason for switching to low-cost housing: "There's a heck of a lot more poor people than rich people."

"Because of the stimulus I figure the housing bill will give to low-cost housing, every house I build this year is going to sell for \$9,500 to \$13,500," declares John Laporte, a Portland builder. Last year all his houses were above the \$13,500 mark.

National Homes reports a substantial part of its sales now are coming from its least expensive prefabricated model, the \$10,000 Fairlane, introduced last November.

[Federal National Mortgage Association news release for April 30, 1958]

FNMA REPORTS BRISK THIRD WEEK FOR EMERGENCY HOUSING PROGRAM—AGENCY SIGNS 2,844 COMMITMENTS IN WEEK TO BUY \$34 MILLION IN MORTGAGES COVERING LOW AND MODERATE PRICED HOUSING

Announcement was made today by the Federal National Mortgage Association that it had entered into commitment contracts totaling \$63,181,000 for the purchase of 5,389 Government-backed mortgages covering low and moderate priced housing under its special assistance program established by the Emergency Housing Act of 1958. This legislation, signed by the President on April 1, authorizes the Association to make commitments to purchase FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages of \$13,500 or less covering housing on which construction has

not started at the time the application is made for FNMA's commitment.

According to FNMA President J. Stanley Baughman these figures reflect FNMA's activities under this program through April 24 and cover 2,333 VA mortgages totaling \$28,806,000 and 3,056 FHA mortgages amounting to \$34,375,000.

Commitments covering 1,657 FHA mortgages for \$19,002,000 and 1,227 VA mortgages for \$15,292,000 totaling 2,884 mortgages valued at \$34,294,000 were made last week.

These figures contrasted with the 410 FHA's for \$3,989,000 and 199 VA's for \$2,455,000 totaling 609 mortgages valued at \$6,444,000 reported for the week ended April 10, the first to reflect the new program's activity, and 989 FHA's for \$11,384,000 and 907 VA's for \$11,059,000 for a total of 1,896 mortgages valued at \$22,443,000 for the week ended April 17.

FNMA activity under the Emergency Housing Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-364, signed Apr. 1, 1958), in number and dollar volume of commitment contracts to purchase FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages

	FHA		VA		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Week ended—						
Apr. 10.....	410	\$3,989,000	199	\$2,455,000	609	\$6,444,000
Apr. 17.....	989	11,384,000	907	11,059,000	1,896	22,443,000
Apr. 24.....	1,657	19,002,000	1,227	15,292,000	2,884	34,294,000
3-week total.....	3,056	34,375,000	2,333	28,806,000	5,389	63,181,000

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the routine morning business is concluded, the Senate shall proceed to a call of the calendar of bills and other measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1431, Senate bill 666, to remove wheat for seeding purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances from the "unfit for human consumption" category for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 1, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 30, 1958:

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named persons to be judges of the Tax Court of the United States for terms of 12 years from June 2, 1958 (reappointments):

Bolon B. Turner, of Arkansas.
John Gregory Bruce, of Kentucky.
Russell S. Train, of the District of Columbia.

Bruce M. Forrester, of Missouri.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John W. Adams
James N. Adkins, Jr.
Max N. Akers
Richard K. Alexander
David L. Allard
George R. Allender
Marcos I. Alvarez
Richard S. Anderson, Jr.
William A. Arata III
James E. Ayars
Charles H. Baker, Jr.
Edwin M. Baldwin
Ronald H. Ballard
Clifford E. Banta III
Stephen P. Barrett
Thomas J. Barry
Harlan B. Bartels
Malcolm G. Bartels
Arthur E. Bass
Frank E. Bassett
George T. Bauer
James L. Bayne
Percy M. Beard, Jr.
Samuel A. Belcher III
Daniel J. Bellay
Gerald E. Bellows
Arthur J. Bennett
Milo R. Beran
Robert P. Berg
John P. Berry
David E. Bertke
John A. Besecker
Murray D. Blank
Russell N. Blatt
Donald A. Boerner
Walter A. Booriakin
Edward L. Borden
William J. Bredbeck
George H. Brenner
August W. Brewer
James G. Brewer
Walter E. Bridgman, Jr.
Arthur V. Broady
Paul E. Brooks
Paul L. Brown
Robert S. Brown
Ralph V. Buck
Stanley M. Budney
Thomas B. Buell
Newton W. Buerger, Jr.
Stanley E. Bump
Keith M. Bunting
Frank W. Butterworth III
William E. Byman
James F. Caldwell
Robert K. Caldwell
Delos S. Calkins, Jr.
Walter H. Cantrell
Richard Carl
Albert A. Carretta, Jr.
Aubrey W. Carson
Wayne L. Chadick
George B. Chafee, Jr.
Michael W. Chapple
Theodore C. Cheney, Jr.
Oddino S. Chiochio, Jr.
Alan M. Chodorow
John A. Chrisman, Jr.
William C. Christenson
Roy E. Clason
Frank J. Clement
James M. Clement, Jr.
Edward M. Clune
John B. Cobb
Freddy W. Coe
Samuel P. Comly III
Francis A. Conery III
Bruce T. Conzelman
Jan W. Cook
Grant A. Cooper
James L. Corder
Richard N. Cordova
Thomas V. Corey
Peter S. Corr, Jr.
Ward W. Correll

David B. Cox
Francis X. Coyle
George K. Coyne, Jr.
Bruce L. Craig
George C. Creighton III
Liles W. Creighton, Jr.
Paul Z. Cummins II
Shane P. Daniels
Stanley "W" Dargis, Jr.
Henry A. Darius, Jr.
Monte D'Armand
Silas C. Daugherty IV
George J. David
Richard E. Davies
James V. Davis
John R. Davis
William H. Dawson
Chapin W. Day, Jr.
Thomas F. Degnan
Daniel H. Demand
George L. Denny II
John J. Ditttrick, Jr.
Leonard P. Donahue, Jr.
Marion T. Doss, Jr.
Robert E. Doty, Jr.
William A. Dougherty, Jr.
Thomas J. Doyle
Theodore F. Driggers
Richard P. Dunbar
William E. Duncan
Clark P. Dyck
William C. Edewaard
Steven H. Edwards
Norman S. Elliott, Jr.
David C. Eppling
Peter E. Erickson
James A. Estep, Jr.
Rowland G. Evans
Ronald M. Eytchison
Bennett W. Farlee
John S. Feeney, Jr.
Henry K. Felix
Joseph D. Fenick, Jr.
George M. Fennell, Jr.
Robert R. Figura
James R. Fisher
Louis H. Fislser
James L. Fitzgerald, Jr.
Thomas E. Fleming
Thomas P. Flood
Robert W. Flynn
William T. Flynn
Peter J. Foley
Raleigh R. Ford
Charles R. Fordham
Thomas P. Forrestal, Jr.
Charles J. Forsman
John F. Fox
Richard A. Fox
Jeremiah Fraher
Nickolas J. Frank III
Michael P. Frawley
William Freakes
Victor I. Fredda, Jr.
Richard C. Freeman
Ronald S. Friedman
Gran F. Fuller
Robert H. Fuller
John H. Galla
John F. Gamboa
John T. Gardner, Jr.
Keith P. Garland
William A. Garvey
Hugh H. Gates
Peter H. Gatje
Kenneth L. Gebhart
Kerry F. Gentry
Thomas Gibbons
David B. Gibson
Richard C. Gibson, Jr.
William J. Gibson
Jack L. Giddens, Jr.
Leo C. Gies
Carl E. Giese, Jr.
Laurence S. Gifford

John K. Gilligan
Phillip R. Given
Thomas Gladding, Jr.
Jack R. Gladin
Frederick K. Glaser
Gordon R. Goldenstein
Michael "E" Goodman
James C. Goodwin, Jr.
John A. Goolsby
Roderick M. Gorton
Irving K. Goto
Albert L. Gottsche, Jr.
Melvin N. Gough, Jr.
William A. Graham, Jr.
Kent L. Granzin
Theodore H. Graver
Robert Gray
William H. Green
Richard P. Greene
Marshall R. Greer, Jr.
Samuel W. Gregg
Hoke D. Griffin
John B. Griffiths
Thomas D. Grimm
Chester J. Grocki
Alvin C. Gross, Jr.
John F. Gruza III
Julian P. Guinn
Stephen F. Guthman
LeRoy R. Haenze
William B. Hale
Marshall B. Hall
David B. Hamilton
James M. Hamrick
Richard E. Hanson
Ray S. Hardy, Jr.
Glynn C. Harper
Charles E. Harrison
David J. Harriss
Robert L. Harshberger
James E. Harvey III
Adolph B. Haugen
William V. Hayes
Charles H. Haughey
Jerry R. Haynes
James F. Healey
Peter M. Heckman, Jr.
Otto J. Helweg
Joseph R. Henderson, Jr.
Noel B. Henderson
Jesse J. Hernandez
Ernest P. Herner, Jr.
Lance Herold
William F. Herrin
James D. Higgins, Jr.
John L. Higgins, Jr.
Martin G. Hill
James E. Hoch
William F. Hodkins
Jack I. Hoel
Peter D. Hofstedt
George R. Holdeman
John D. Holland, Jr.
Bruce A. Holmberg
Robert E. Holroyd
Hollis L. Holthaus
Alan E. Hospes
William C. Hotard
Guy M. Houston, Jr.
William S. Howard III
Francis M. Hughes, Jr.
John B. Hulme
John J. Hummer
Harold C. Hunter
Joseph D. Hutchinson
Donald J. Hynes
James E. Igoe, Jr.
Walter S. Illick, Jr.
Arthur L. Immerman
Carl E. Ingle
Forney H. Ingram, Jr.
Ronald F. Ingram
James Izard
Perry Y. Jackson, Jr.
Thomas L. Jacobs
George J. Jenkins, Jr.
David H. Johnson
Lester O. Johnson, Jr.

Richard V. Johnson
 Ronald L. Johnson
 Peter J. Kanovich
 Donald W. Jones
 William R. Jones
 Julius R. Juliano
 Fredric C. Kane, Jr.
 Larry E. Kaufman
 Clarence H. Keim
 Frederick W. Keith, Jr.
 Robert T. S. Keith, Jr.
 James A. Kenney
 Edward L. Kessler, Jr.
 Leigh G. Kimmel
 George J. King, Jr.
 Peter A. Kirby
 Ronald B. Kirk
 Paul R. Klinedinst, Jr.
 Harry W. Konkel
 Robert R. Kornegay
 Charles J. Korzinek
 Tracy M. Kosoff
 Jacob C. Kraft
 George E. Krauter
 Clinton W. Kretzner
 William H. Krumrei
 Martin F. Kuhneman
 Chester A. Kunz, Jr.
 Thomas J. Lamb
 Robert J. Lamoureux
 Raymond G. Landrum
 Robert E. Lane
 Robert J. Lanoue
 Charles R. Larson
 Jerold J. Larson
 Lawrence P. Larson
 Charles W. Larzelere, III
 Kent B. Lawrence
 Robert D. Lawrence
 Milton H. Leake
 John A. Leary II
 Jean R. LeBer
 Daniel B. Leonard, Jr.
 John A. Lima
 Eugene E. Lindsey, Jr.
 George F. Lisle
 Joseph N. Longton
 John M. Lorusso
 Philip E. Love
 Richard E. Lovejoy
 Lewis D. Lovitt, Jr.
 Ralph W. Luce III
 Ernest C. Luders
 Leo A. Lukenas
 Alexander M. Lupfer, Jr.
 Hylan B. Lyon, Jr.
 James R. Lyons
 Michael D. Lyons
 Samuel J. Lyons, Jr.
 John S. McCain III
 Bruce McCandless II
 Jonathan C. McCarter
 Kenneth G. McClure
 Harry E. McConnell
 Martin L. McCullough
 Wayne H. McKee
 Gene T. McKenzie
 Michael J. McLane
 John C. McMichael, Jr.
 John G. McMillan
 Phillip F. McNall
 Robert P. McNergney
 James E. McNeill III
 George R. McNulty
 Joseph G. McPadden
 William F. Macauley
 Robert M. MacGregor
 Franklin F. Mackenzie
 John H. MacKinnon
 Rupert E. MacLean, Jr.
 Donald W. MacNeill
 Thomas C. Maloney
 Eric G. Mansfield, Jr.
 Joseph S. Mansfield, Jr.

Wallace W. Marshall, Jr.
 Alex A. Martella, Jr.
 James R. Martinez
 Robert H. Mason
 Lance B. Massey
 John W. Matheson
 Wesley May
 Daniel F. Mayers
 Lee M. Meador
 George R. Meinig, Jr.
 Stuart A. Merriken
 Ernest A. Merritt
 Theodore R. Merry
 Donald J. Meyer
 Peter N. Midgarden
 Henry W. Miller, Jr.
 Paul J. Miller
 Robert L. Miller
 Leon M. Mink
 Kenneth F. Mitchell
 Walter F. Mitchell
 Herbert Moll
 James T. Moore
 William N. Moore
 Francis J. Moran, Jr.
 David E. Morgan
 Clyde C. Morris
 William P. Mortenson
 Russell V. Mowery
 Lincoln H. Mueller
 George C. Mullin
 Tom S. Murphree
 Robert W. Musgrove
 George D. Myers II
 Chester A. Nagle
 Ivan V. A. Nance, Jr.
 Arthur T. Narro
 Robert M. Nazak
 David A. Newcomb
 Jack R. Nicholas, Jr.
 John P. Nickerson
 Robert P. Nicolls
 John L. Nulty, Jr.
 Roger M. Nutting
 Peter C. Nystrom
 Frank O'Beirne, Jr.
 Michael G. O'Connor, II
 Walter P. O'Connor
 Edwin W. Oldham
 Charles A. Oleson
 William H. Oliver
 William F. Omberg
 Christian N. Ondishko
 Thomas E. O'Neill
 Jack D. Osborn
 Ramon R. Owens
 Howard L. Pabst
 Hugh L. Palmer
 James A. Palmer, Jr.
 Joseph N. Panzarino
 Samuel A. Parker
 Terrence J. Parks
 William H. Parks
 Zachariah T. Pate, Jr.
 Richard F. Patterson
 Joseph F. Paull
 Charles R. Peele, Jr.
 Eugene J. Peltier, Jr.
 William T. Pendley
 Robert S. Perkins, Jr.
 Donald L. Peters
 John D. Peters
 William J. Peters III
 Carl J. Peterson
 Charles B. Peterson
 Charles O. Peterson
 Frank Petinos
 John T. Pettit, Jr.
 Robert E. Phillips
 Robert H. Pidgeon
 John P. Pierce, Jr.
 Massey L. Pierce
 Richard K. Pierson
 John M. Pinto, Jr.
 Richard F. Pittenger
 William D. Pivarnik
 John M. Poindexter

Paul A. Polski
 John L. Potter
 Stanley Poremba, Jr.
 Joseph C. Port
 Gene H. Porter
 Robert J. Prather, Jr.
 John P. Price
 Terry R. Priebe
 William G. Prince
 Wayne E. Pulling
 Wayne A. Putnam
 Arnold F. Pyatt
 Allan Rachap
 John M. Radigan
 Thomas J. Radziej
 George J. Ranes
 Keith L. Rasmussen
 Victor J. Raudio
 Calvin H. Reed
 Harold L. Reeger
 Lawrence R. Reid, Jr.
 Roy L. Reinarz, Jr.
 Walter A. Reister
 John C. Rennie
 Raymond C. Riches
 William R. Ring
 Alan G. Roach
 Berton A. Robbins III
 John E. Robbins
 Gary K. Roberts
 Peter S. Roder
 Richard D. Rogers
 John D. Rohrbough
 William H. Rorer III
 Eugene F. Rosadino
 David V. Rowe
 Robert W. Rowe
 Scott M. Ruby
 Nils Rueckert
 Melvin A. Runzo
 Carl F. Russ
 Harold B. Russell
 John Ruth
 George R. Ruwwe
 Bernard A. Ryan, Jr.
 Walter R. Ryan, Jr.
 William R. Sachse
 Robert C. Sauer
 Gordon M. Schaaf
 Lawrence H. Schlang
 Ronald A. Schnepfer
 William G. Schramm
 Clyde C. Schroeder
 William J. Schulz
 Allen B. Schwitzer
 Wayne E. Scott, Jr.
 John J. Seeberger
 George F. Segelbacher
 Joseph M. Sendek
 Jack L. Shafer
 Louis P. Shane
 Stanley E. Sharp
 Robert L. I. Shearer
 James E. Sheehan
 Norman W. Shriver
 John F. Sickman, Jr.
 James S. Silldorf
 George C. Skezas
 Alvin V. Skiles III
 Robert K. Slaven, Jr.
 Kelson E. Slayman
 Edwin B. Smedberg
 Charles J. Smith
 Frank W. Smith
 Leon T. Smith
 William B. Smith
 William L. Smith
 Richard S. Sorensen
 William T. Spane, Jr.
 Richard B. Stack
 Robert D. Stannus
 Joseph L. Steckler
 Graves B. Stephenson

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Gregory D. Bernatz
 Donald B. Bernes
 Charles J. Bowne, Jr.
 Charles H. Brooks, Jr.

Robert W. Stibler
 Herbert L. Stiff
 Paul F. Stillier
 Gregory F. Streeter
 Josiah D. Stryker
 David W. Stubbs
 George R. Stubbs
 Frederick B. Stumcke, Jr.
 Henry D. Sturr, Jr.
 Henry C. Surratt, Jr.
 Jack D. Sutton
 Alasdair E. Swanson
 John P. Swope
 Curtis S. Sword, Jr.
 Denis J. Taft
 Donald C. Tarquin
 Brent W. Taylor
 Donald A. Taylor
 James T. Taylor, Jr.
 Philip H. Taylor
 Richard "E" Tennent, Jr.
 Eric F. Thacher
 Leo E. Therrien, Jr.
 Thomas W. Top
 Robert L. Topping
 Carl J. Triebes, Jr.
 Leslie P. Troolin
 Darrell C. Troutman
 Fred G. Troutman
 Paul C. Tucker
 Walker S. Uhlhorn, Jr.
 James V. VanHoose
 Richard D. VanLandingham
 Henry G. Vargo
 Robert R. Vaughan
 Guy D. Veasey
 Robert L. Venable
 John C. Vick
 Alfred E. Victor
 Frederick L. Wales
 John J. Wandell, Jr.
 Sinkler Warley, Jr.
 Robert L. Warren
 George L. Watts
 Stephen T. Webster
 John A. Wedell
 Robert L. Weibly
 James G. Weigand
 Paul L. Weltfle, Jr.
 Bradford W. Welles
 Robert D. Wells
 Thomas A. Werner
 Ralph W. West, Jr.
 Dale A. Westbrook
 Kenneth A. Westphal
 Theodore C. White
 Richard P. Whitney
 Franz R. Wiedemann
 Bruce A. Wilcox
 Christopher B. Wilhelmly
 George W. Williams
 James D. Williams
 James R. Williams
 Theodore M. Williams
 Wayne A. Williams
 Dennis K. Wilson
 James S. Wilson, Jr.
 Richard J. Wilson
 William Z. Withers
 James A. Wood
 Michael G. Woodbury
 Richard P. Woodley
 Phillip L. Work
 James C. Wright
 Leo C. Wright
 Charles R. Yarbrough
 Albert N. Yost
 William K. Young, Jr.

David G. Burden
 Ralph J. Carestia
 James S. Clarkson
 William R. Drury
 Frederick R. Fry
 John M. Halliday
 Charles V. Hanna
 John W. Hatchett
 Chesley M. Hicks, Jr.
 John T. Kennard
 Graydon F. Lombard
 Charles W. Lord

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James B. Caughman, Jr.
 Michael M. Dallam
 Owen M. Kirkley
 Kenneth B. Knox
 Jimmie G. Marshall
 Benjamin F. Montoya
 William A. Simmons, Jr.
 Thomas H. Thoureen
 John A. Walter

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert G. Affleck
 James E. Alden
 John Alden, Jr.
 Paul B. Alker
 John W. Anderson
 Ralph P. Anderson
 Thorwald "H" Anderson
 Preston W. Angell
 Anthony I. Antonio, Jr.
 David W. Arnold
 Richard T. Ashman
 Jay G. Baetz
 John E. Baillis
 John K. Baker
 Roger E. Baldwin
 Robert L. Beck
 George J. Bednar
 Roger L. Berg
 Roger W. Berger
 Harris "I" Berkowitz
 Thomas B. Bigford
 John P. Bird
 Jimmie R. Boatright
 Julian R. Bockerman
 Thomas L. Boennighausen
 Wayne N. Bohlke
 Reber F. Boulton, Jr.
 Courtney B. Bourns
 Bernhard A. Brakke
 James D. Brown
 Roger A. Brown
 Walter P. Bruen, Jr.
 Norman L. Burnett
 William R. Butler
 John W. Cameron
 Craig S. Campbell
 Wayne A. Carbiener
 Stanley J. Chesney, Jr.
 Robert J. Ciehnicky
 Donald R. Clark
 John C. Clinton
 Robert B. Clothier, Jr.
 Jack H. Coldewei
 John A. Collier
 Richard S. Collier
 David W. Conover
 David R. Cox
 Kenneth E. Cox
 Richard C. Dahl
 Joseph A. D'Appolito
 Richard C. Darcey
 Richard A. Darling
 David L. Davidson
 Daniel W. Dearasaugh, Jr.
 John T. Decker
 Thomas P. Develin
 Robert L. Dolbeare
 Clifford C. Dougherty, Jr.
 Terry C. Drake
 Rodney F. DuBois
 Daniel C. Dunlap
 William P. Dunn
 James M. Durante
 Robert M. Eade
 Robert N. Edney
 Ronald R. Edwards
 William W. Elliott IV
 Russell A. Ellis
 David L. Emmert
 Harold F. Enright
 Wayne R. Ericksen
 Paul E. Felton, Jr.
 William D. Forsyth, Jr.
 Edward K. Frear
 Scott L. Garrett
 Donald W. Garrison
 John P. Gould
 Robert B. Grafton
 Roger L. Grant
 Stephen H. Gushee
 Richard A. Haas
 Edmund "A" Hajim
 Joe E. Hammer
 William C. Harding
 David W. Harned
 Malcolm R. Harvey
 Thomas W. Harwell
 Clair E. Heckathorne
 Brooke R. Heckman
 Henry A. Holmes
 David E. Holt, Jr.
 George S. Hoover
 Ronald W. Hough
 Walter E. Huff
 Robert P. Hughes
 Alonzo B. Huntsman, Jr.
 Harold S. Hutchison, Jr.
 Jack C. Hyde
 John W. Jablonski
 James D. Jennett
 Karl F. Jennings
 Ronald L. Jensen
 Robert L. Johns
 George K. Johnson
 Paul H. Johnson
 James P. Jolly
 James F. Judson
 Edwin S. Keasler, Jr.
 Earle L. Kitts, Jr.
 Ronald W. Knox
 David E. Labovitz
 Eugene Lee, Jr.
 Robert R. Lee
 Roger L. Levin
 Arthur E. Lindberg
 Gerald J. Lindquist
 Paxton "D" Lockhart
 Christopher S. Lohnes
 Robert A. Lowrey

William D. Lyon
 Frank S. McLaughlin, Jr.
 Lauren L. McMaster III
 Arleigh E. Machemehl
 James A. Major
 Robert T. Marold
 William M. Mathews
 Reid T. Melville
 Francis B. Michels
 Roger D. Middlekauff, Jr.
 Howard Miller
 William H. Miller
 James R. Miltenberger
 Richard C. Montgomery
 Tyman R. Moon
 William R. Moorman
 James F. Morgan
 Emmett T. Mueller
 Robert J. Murphy III
 Richard C. Nelson
 George B. Newton, Jr.
 Harvey W. Nix, Jr.
 Harold A. Noring
 Clifford E. Olivera
 Benhart H. Olson
 Richard L. Olsonoski
 Douglas L. Orme
 Martin K. Pedigo
 David L. Pendleton
 Lawson M. Phye
 Henry N. Pollack
 Otto G. Raabe, Jr.
 Donald J. Reeves
 James H. Rich, Jr.
 William L. Riddle
 Hardy A. Risteen
 John J. Roach, Jr.
 John J. Roberts
 Carl W. Robertson
 Kenneth A. Robison
 Edward L. Rohm
 James A. Rossi
 Glendon Rowell
 Mervyn L. Rudee
 Thomas N. Ryder
 Richard K. Sager
 Paul S. Sakuda
 Robert P. Sanchez
 Robert G. Sansom, Jr.
 Frederick W. Saunders
 Kenneth A. Saunders

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert O. Artner, Jr.
 Walter I. Austin
 James H. Baker
 Ronald A. Bero
 John H. Blackford
 Robert A. Brayshaw
 Rodney E. Brunker
 Robert P. Bryant
 Charles O. Campbell
 Cecil D. Conlee
 Timothy P. Coogan
 David D. Crane
 Walter J. DeGroot, Jr.
 Ralph B. Draughon, Jr.
 Bernard A. Dunn
 William B. Early
 Harry H. Ekholm, Jr.
 Jerald R. Forster
 Duane L. Furan
 Stuart K. Gord
 Edward W. Hargadon
 Harland D. Harris III
 Thomas G. Harvey, Jr.
 Curtis C. Higgins
 Edward L. Kocan

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject

Donald A. Schneider
 John C. Schulz
 Jay A. Severance
 Kenneth R. Skivington
 Bartley P. Smith
 Phillip A. Snell, Jr.
 Larry Spear
 Stuart B. Spence
 Melvin S. Spielberger
 Marshall W. Sprigg
 Robert E. Spydell
 Orlin M. Stansfield
 James O. Stepp
 Herbert A. Stokely
 David F. Sutter
 Stephen P. Sutton
 John H. Tate, Jr.
 John H. Thielman
 Charles R. Thompson
 Donald L. Tiedeman
 Raymond M. Torick
 Robert J. Townsend
 William G. Trussell
 Karl J. Turecek
 Paul B. Uhlenhop
 Michael J. Verner
 Henry G. Viets
 Fredric J. Wade
 Norbert Wagner
 Robert L. Walters
 John L. Way
 Theodore G. Weeks, Jr.

William H. Weidenbach, Jr.
 George A. Weidner
 David R. Weisel
 Jerry D. Westbrook
 Robert W. Westgate
 Clarence C. Whitney
 John S. Williams
 George S. Wills
 William A. Wineberg, Jr.
 Martin Wolman
 John H. Wood
 Jess B. Woods, Jr.
 Donald N. Wright
 Wilbur A. Wright
 Robert D. Yeager
 Richard G. Young
 Harry J. Zimmer
 Robert M. Zorn, Jr.

to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James E. Bodamer
 William M. Boyer
 Glenn S. Calvert, Jr.
 Herbert L. Dozier, Jr.
 Arthur W. Fort
 Dante Fullini
 John O. Hamel
 Edward J. Kaiser
 Richard G. Kauffman
 Arthur D. Kohler, Jr.
 Richard A. Lowery
 Thomas B. Mattox
 Frederick Z. Mills

Harlan L. Lane (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James G. Harmeling
 Elliot I. Morrison
 Howard E. Waldstreicher

The following-named Reserve officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

COMMANDER
 Roland W. Jones
 LIEUTENANT COMMANDER
 Joseph M. McGinley

LIEUTENANT
 Adolphus R. Allison, Jr.
 Burness F. Ansell, Jr.
 Charles E. Brodine
 Anthony Dede
 Robert H. Easterday
 William N. Fender
 Rafael Fernandez
 Donald M. Kinkel

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)
 Franklin D. Beary
 Wesley W. Boucher
 Carl T. Brighton
 John W. Davis

George D. Mitchell, Reserve officer, to be a lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy, and to be promoted to the grade of lieutenant commander when his line running mate is so promoted, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named Reserve officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

COMMANDER
 Joseph M. McGinley
 LIEUTENANT
 Franklin D. Beary
 Wesley W. Boucher
 Carl T. Brighton
 John W. Davis

The following-named officers to be lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

George C. Fischer, Jr.
 Steven W. Perand

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy, and to be promoted to the grade of lieutenant when their line running mates are so promoted, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Edwin G. Abate
 Daryl M. Allman
 Charles V. Beesley
 Peter R. Boeke
 Victor L. Chesser

Franz H. Misch
 Thomas W. Moody
 William A. Olson
 James M. Osterhoff
 Michael V. Sherbrook
 Arnold R. Smythe, Jr.
 Loyal R. Updegrove
 James A. Williams
 James L. Wilson III
 Frederick H. Wolf
 Robert F. Worley
 Donald E. Wudtke

Robert E. Huettner
 John F. Lessig
 Bruce W. Novark

Preston L. Smith
 Bobby L. Swalm
 James D. Swenson

The following-named officer candidates to be ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Douglas N. Adams
 Kenneth W. Adams
 John D. Albright
 Carl W. Amick
 Marion A. Atwell
 John R. Beatty
 James D. Beaubie
 Henry M. Bechtel, Jr.
 Roy T. Beckner
 Karl R. Bernet
 Fredrick E. Blair
 Bennie E. Bough
 James P. Boyd, Jr.
 John J. Brennan
 George Brining
 Virgil E. Brock
 Charles H. Brown
 Frank H. Brown
 Lawrence D. Bryant
 Robert J. Burchardt
 James R. Burnett
 Vernon R. Bussard, Jr.
 Arnold L. Busse
 Billy F. Caldwell
 Lawrence J. Carpenter
 Robert E. Carr
 Macey M. Casebeer
 Beveardge L. Cash
 Elijah J. Cass, Jr.
 Donald E. Cates
 Frederick W. Chapman
 William F. Chapman
 Lawrence W. Cook
 Walter O. Crusinberry
 Joseph H. Cyr, Jr.
 Donald L. Darling
 Billy E. Davis
 Edgar M. Delbert
 Edgar E. DeLong
 Martell E. Dewrell
 Theodis Dillard
 Pat Duncan
 Lovelace J. Dupre, Jr.
 Thomas R. Duvall
 Roger A. Eddy
 Frank L. Edmunds, Jr.
 Scott Edwards
 John R. Eggleston
 Harold D. Elliott
 Howard R. Ellis
 Arthur F. Ensley
 Albert R. Estes, Jr.
 George Estock, Jr.
 Howard J. Fees, Jr.
 Robert H. Ferguson
 Thomas L. Flanagan
 Warren J. Fordham
 Harris P. Gary, Jr.
 William T. George
 James R. Giesea
 Harold A. Goldsberry
 John E. Goodrow
 Bruce P. Gordon
 Daniel H. Grace
 Joseph D. Graceffa
 Norman D. Greer
 Kenneth R. Gustafson
 Edwin C. Hagedorn
 James W. Hale, Jr.
 Hubert M. Haller
 Ralph A. Halverson
 Gerald A. Harkless
 Dowel W. Harrell
 Wilford H. Harvey
 James R. Hawkins
 Ray M. Hawkins
 Richard W. Hayward
 Watson L. Hobbs
 Jack A. Hodgson
 Floyd W. Holloman
 Jerry L. Holt
 Arthur E. Holzhaeuser
 Leonard L. Houston

George H. Hulderman
 Kenneth M. Hydorn
 Milton Jackson, Jr.
 Warren D. Jackson
 John J. Jamroga
 John L. Jels III
 William A. Johnston
 Eugene P. Jones
 Billy F. Judis
 Robert P. Kendall
 Charles R. Kitchens
 Robert M. Kofoed
 Robert G. Korslund
 Orton G. Krueger
 Charles F. Laws
 Edward L. Leiser
 Frederick E. Lewis
 James G. Livzley
 Joseph H. Lualien, Jr.
 James R. Lusk
 Claude O. Lysaght
 Richard L. Mabrey
 Robert F. Magee
 Robert D. Mahoney
 Bruce D. Martz, Jr.
 Lawrence L. Massa
 James C. Maxton
 John R. Maxwell
 Donald E. McAtee
 Allen D. McNelly
 James L. McVicker
 Wesley L. Middleton
 Billy G. Miller
 Charles L. Miller
 Latnay H. Miller, Jr.
 Clyde L. Moore
 Jack R. Moore
 Billy R. Morrow
 Harold Morton, Jr.
 William J. Mullaly
 Deighton J. Muller
 Mark V. V. Nelson
 Walker D. Nicholson
 Lyle G. Nordhaugen
 Edward A. Olmstead
 George Oncea
 James T. Osborne
 Dudley R. Overton
 Philip C. Painter
 Lawrence M. Patella
 William D. Patrick
 Victor P. Peri
 Milton G. Peters
 Donald L. Pfister
 Raymond C. Phillips
 Stanley Piskorski
 Charles E. Poarch
 Grant H. Pollock
 Billie L. Price
 Eugene F. Quinn
 Lee I. Reber
 Richard L. Reinhardt
 Russell B. Rentsch
 Lloyd K. Rice
 Daniel R. Rivera
 Delma C. Robison, Jr.
 Donald R. Rowden
 Perry R. Royle, Jr.
 Vernon R. Scarbrough
 Andrew D. Scram
 LeVerne E. Severson
 James W. Shelton
 Donald D. Sheppard
 Theodore L. Shope
 John Smarz, Jr.
 Robert L. Sminkey
 James C. Smith
 Eugene A. Spadoni
 Ernest G.
 Stavropoulos
 Samuel Steed
 Donald A. Stehlin
 Robert V. Stevely

William O. Stinson
Cecil G. Stockton
Robert L. Stone
Roy K. Story
William E. Stoudt
Edward L. Street
Jack D. Sturgill
John R. Swain
Willis M. Swarthwood
Harry Symons, Jr.
James E. Tedder
Angus B. Thomas
Jack R. Thomas
Robert H. Thomas
Russell G. VanMoppes
Thomas L. VanPetten

Grace L. Field (woman officer candidate) to be an ensign in the line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officer candidates to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Thomas A. Bell
Joseph L. Cejka
Claude H. Drake
Charles C. Eye
Patrick F. Flanagan
Roger D. Gillingham
Allan H. Hanson
Daniel G. Hartlieb
Carl F. Huth, Jr.
Omer L. Johnson
Kenneth E. Livingston
Samuel S. Montgomery

Vernon P. Perry (officer candidate) to be an ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officer candidates selected as alternates, to be ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James N. Benson
Amos "M" Blevins
John W. Brackett
Arthur G. Crawford
John W. Duncan
Gaston O. Easley
Coleman J. Gadbow, Jr.
Wayne G. Henley
Harry H. Hudgins

The following-named officer candidates selected as alternates, to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Michael A. Benson
George C. Brown
William O. Buckalew, Jr.
Ralph Conrad
Robert B. Giles

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

Lee R. Boles
Gerald F. Brackett
James A. Bridge, Jr.
George P. Brown
Dominic A. Bryla
Lloyd M. Bucher
Lawrence P. Bunyan
Earnest H. Carson
Benjamin W. Cloud
Walter N. Cottrell
Joseph M. Culbert, Jr.
Robert W. Dolan
Jack "B" Elliott
Andrew C. Ferguson
Fred R. Gaskell
Clifton G. Gent

John T. Vinson
Robert M. Watkins
Clayton R. White
Howard G. White
Donald L. Wilburn
Charles A. Wilkerson
Everette D. Wills
Robert D. Wilson
Carl J. Winter
Daniel C. Woods
Robert N. Woods, Jr.
Melvin R. Woody
Everett F. Worden
Ernest C. Yoes
Ernest Zorn
Nicholas D. Zorn

Robert H. Robertson, Jr.
Peter Rock
George G. Spence, Jr.
Gerald E. Sveen
Junior J. Watson
Peter J. Welzbacker
Hugh H. Wheeler
Roy Willett
James Wilson, Jr.
Frank N. Winn

Gerald C. Hudnall
James H. LeClare
Edward A. Morrow
Elmer W. Peterson
John M. Renwick
Bobbie L. Sample
Donald E. Smith
Arthur J. Walker
Richard A. Wood

Rogers E. Hall
George H. Houk
Beauford A. Long
Harvey S. Loomis
James L. Myrah
Robert L. Tutas

Ronald P. Good
William F. Hahnert, Jr.
Wayne A. Johansen
Cornelius Kastelein
George I. Knowles
John H. McAlevy
Samuel R. Marshall
Allan R. Mitchell
Louis D. Neill, Jr.
Robert L. Newman
Terence P. O'Brien
John S. Oster
Glenn L. Palatini
George D. Pixley
William L. Reger

Robert J. Richards
William J. Rigney
Donald W. Roe, Jr.
Richard E. Runyon
William A. Russ
Oscar E. Sanden, Jr.
Richard R. Skeen
Jack L. Sotherland, Jr.
Van E. Spradley

LEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Billy J. Adams
Jerry P. Anderson
Richard J. Brennan
Ming E. Chang
Richard V. Christopher
Wallace F. Doolittle, Jr.
John W. Ford
John F. J. Fox
David H. Foxworth
James S. Gardner
Thomas C. Grier, Jr.
Joey W. Hegeman
Milton D. Honea
Richard E. Johe
Anthony J. Kral
Simon C. Kralik
John D. Larson, Jr.
Victor D. Larsen
Ramsay Lawson

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LEUTENANT

James R. Babb
Norman R. Baty
Robert C. Brandenburg
John G. Carpenter
Cecil S. Colee
Everett S. Eckersley
Stephen L. Hart
Arthur G. Lusklin

LEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

James M. Alderson
Alfred F. Beavert
Lee R. Boles
Gerald F. Brackett
James A. Bridge, Jr.
Frederick P. Brown
George P. Brown
Richard B. Brown
Thomas F. Brown III
Dominic A. Bryla
Lloyd M. Bucher
Jerry L. Bullard
Lawrence P. Bunyan
Earnest H. Carson
Ralph B. Cazares
Benjamin W. Cloud
Walter N. Cottrell
Joseph M. Culbert, Jr.
Richard S. Cumming III
Glen G. DeBroder
George K. Dickson
Robert W. Dolan
Jack "B" Elliott
Leroy Evrad
Andrew C. Ferguson
Arthur L. Fish
John P. Flick
Raymond C. Fonda
William L. Galli
Fred R. Gaskell
Clifton G. Gent
Stanley R. Golanka
Ronald P. Good
William F. Hahnert, Jr.
Barry F. Hampe
William E. Janes, Jr.
Robert G. Jewett
Wayne A. Johansen
Cornelius Kastelein
Peter W. Kellaway
Richard L. Kiehl
John R. Koils

Charles N. Straney
Arthur A. Strunk
Robert H. Sullivan
Lee A. Tavis
James V. Walters
Robert E. Weedon
Elmer C. Whiddon, Jr.
Richard E. White

John M. Loscavio
Bruce W. Lovell
David L. McDonald
James A. Maxwell, Jr.
Wilton H. McIntire
Horst A. Petrich
Leo V. Rabuck
Charles N. Robbins
John R. L. Scarborough
Peter R. Schmidt
John D. Sink
Donald F. Strand
Robert C. Taylor, Jr.
Theodore R. Thompson
Roy D. Varner, Jr.
Richard J. Wallace
Beverly W. Wither-
spoon
James R. Wyly, Jr.

Chester J. Thrailkill
John L. Townley
George L. Vandewater, Jr.
Casper R. VanDien
James V. Walters
Thomas H. Watson

ENSIGN

Billy J. Adams
Jerry P. Anderson
Richard J. Brennan
Ming E. Chang
Richard V. Christopher
Wallace F. Doolittle, Jr.
John W. Ford
John F. J. Fox
David H. Foxworth
James S. Gardner
Thomas C. Grier, Jr.
Joey W. Hegeman
Milton D. Honea
Richard E. Johe
Anthony J. Kral
Simon C. Kralik
John D. Larson, Jr.
Victor D. Larsen
Ramsay Lawson

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy (special-duty-only law), subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LEUTENANT

LaVerne E. Evans
Coleman E. Myers

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LEUTENANT

Joseph D. Geller

LEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Coleman E. Myers
LaVerne E. Evans

The following-named women officers to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Jacqueline L. Bakosh
Shirley J. Falls
Jeanne L. Murphy

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LEUTENANT

Patricia I. McKenna
Nancy M. Walsh
Rosemarie C. Walsh

LEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Clydena L. Clinton
Margaret E. Letham
Margaret A. McIlraith

ENSIGN

Carol A. Adsit
Jacqueline L. Bakosh
Mary J. Downing

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LEUTENANT

Donald R. Kelley

LEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Frederick W. Breidenstein
Andrew J. Zseltvay, Jr.

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Donald R. Kelley

ENSIGN

Frederick W. Breidenstein
Charles W. Halverson
Andrew J. Zseltvay, Jr.

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Richard B. Bennett Dean S. Mercer
Robert E. Flold John W. Paul
Kenneth R. Maxwell Bernard L. Recher

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Alvin D. Schaaf, Jr. Thomas L. Vannaman
James A. Szwed John C. Webster
Clyde E. Tudor Roger C. Wilson

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

James D. Pollen

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Donald A. Beals Kenneth R. Maxwell
Richard B. Bennett Dean S. Mercer
Cyril H. Buehler John W. Paul
Robert E. Flold Bernard L. Recher
Michael H. Hamilton Frank K. Wilson
Milford A. Leal

ENSIGN

Charles L. Chipley, Jr. Clyde E. Tudor
Stuart F. Platt Thomas L. Vannaman
Alvin D. Schaaf, Jr. John C. Webster
James A. Szwed Roger C. Wilson

The following-named women Reserve officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Kathryn L. Wham

The following-named for permanent appointment:

ENSIGN

Emily L. Brown
Kathryn L. Wham

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Robert L. Bigler Raymond J. Dietrich
John C. Condit Marvin W. Howard

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Robert L. Bigler William C. League
John C. Condit John G. Newton
Raymond J. Dietrich Maurice R. VanLan-
Donald F. Doxie ingham, Jr.
Marvin W. Howard

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

John F. Hall
Henry C. Sherrod, Jr.

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

John F. Hall
Robert C. Peace
Henry C. Sherrod, Jr.

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Martha L. Boring Catherine M. McCleary
Emma L. Dannan Elizabeth C. Strang
Hazel Funk Phyllis R. Taylor
Ruth E. Kueth Dorothy Turner

LIEUTENANT

Mary A. Brogan Barbara R. Courtright
Lois E. Burke Mary E. A. Fitzpatrick

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Martha L. Boring Constance H. Rowe
Rose M. David Elizabeth C. Strang
Emma L. Dannan Phyllis R. Taylor
Hazel Funk Dorothy Turner
Ruth E. Kueth Ruby E. Walker
Catherine M. McCleary

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Mary A. Brogan Mary E. A. Fitzpatrick
Lois E. Burke Beverly J. Sparks
Barbara R. Courtright

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy (special duty only, Communications), subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Henry J. Davis, Jr. Norman Klar
Paul W. Dillingham, Jr. Clyde D. McDonald
Theodore F. Johnson Kirby L. Robinson
Richard L. Kallaus John K. Wulforst

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

John K. Cowperthwaite Hobart J. Edmonds, Jr.
Joseph M. Devonchik Eugene H. Platzek

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Henry J. Davis, Jr. Norman Klar
Paul W. Dillingham, Jr. Clyde D. McDonald
Theodore F. Johnson Kirby L. Robinson
Richard L. Kallaus John K. Wulforst

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy (special duty only, Intelligence), subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Robert B. Bathurst
Robert L. Chartrand

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

John Gordon
George J. O'Donnell, Jr.

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Robert B. Bathurst
Robert L. Chartrand

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy (special duty

only, Public Information), subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Joseph W. Stierman, Jr.

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Philip S. Havran

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Thomas A. Loomis

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Joseph W. Stierman, Jr.

ENSIGN

Philip S. Havran

The following-named officers to be permanent chief warrant officers, W-4, in the United States Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Boyd D. Hughes
Troy M. McKinney

Joseph E. Schirmer, retired officer, to be a permanent chief warrant officer, W-3, in the United States Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated:

CAPTAIN, DENTAL CORPS

George O. Stead

LIEUTENANT, LINE

Donald G. Scully Thomas J. Herbert
Rollin E. Jeffries, Jr. Jack H. Hartley
William H. C. Self James R. Redman
Robert D. Rohde David J. Keeney
Lawrence V. Grant Lloyd D. Beatty

LIEUTENANT, CHAPLAIN CORPS

John J. O'Connor
Joseph T. Dimino

LIEUTENANT, NURSE CORPS

Pauline F. Prest
Ann Sefchok

The following-named officers of the Medical Corps of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of commander, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Francis W. Burke
Paul H. Sebrechts

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and staff corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

William M. Russell

MEDICAL CORPS

George D. Mitchell
Dermot A. Murray

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Thomas J. Wooten

The following-named line officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Frederick P. Brown John B. Rivers
Richard B. Brown Ronald G. Shelly
Paul W. Dillingham, Jr. William Y. Sneed
George A. Hume Herbert J. Steffes
Norman Klar Joseph W. Stierman, Jr.
William J. Moredock Glenn F. Thomas
Walter L. Nyland John L. Townley
Deane G. Peters Jack T. Weir
William V. Polleys III

The following-named line officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade

of lieutenant (junior grade), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John B. Rivers Scott A. Shaw
John S. Scrimgeour, Glenn F. Thomas
Jr.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE
Leonard J. Abbott Geoffrey H. Ball
Paul L. Abernethy, Jr. Stanley M. Ball
Harold G. Adams Charles W. Ballaw
John L. Adams Robert M. Ballinger
Jackie D. Adams Leo J. Balsamo
James L. Adams Floyd R. Banbury
Winthrop R. Adkins John M. Bannon
William M. Ahlenius Robert D. Banz
Herbert W. Ahrens, Jr. Richard H. Barbe
John W. Ailes IV Gale D. Barbee
Gerald L. Ainsworth Robert F. Bardwell
Charles F. Ake Charles B. Barfoot
Harold C. Albin, Jr. Theodore W. Barger
Charles R. Albritton Monroe W. Barker
Donal M. Alderson, Jr. Howard W. Barnes
Thomas L. Aldrich Walter A. Barr
Loyal F. Aldridge James J. Barrett
Donald A. Alecxih James M. Barrett
Howard W. Alexander Fred H. Barrows III
James W. Alexander Marion D. Bartlett
Dean C. Allard, Jr. Robert D. Bascom
Bill R. Allen Paul D. Batdorf
Charles A. Allen Glenn D. Bates
John C. Allen Roy E. Battles
Neal M. Allen John R. Batzler
Peter F. Allen James R. Bauder
Bruce T. Allgood, Jr. Gerard R. Baumann,
Thomas L. Allison, Jr. John P. Baumgartner
Richard R. Allison William J. Baxter, Jr.
Kent S. Allworth Norman T. Beal
Frederick J. Almgren, Jr. Alan L. Bean
Harris J. Amhowitz Ralph C. Beardslee,
George Anagnostos Jr.
Ray J. Anderson Leroy R. Bechelmayer
Erns M. Anderson Richard N. Bechtel
Paul R. Anderson Norman E. Beck
Jon T. Anderson William H. Becker
Joseph J. Anderson Thomas S. Beeler
James C. Anderson Douglas W. Bel, Jr.
Frank N. Ansel William J. Belay
George S. Ansell Charles E. Bell, Jr.
Charles Antonacos William R. Bell
David W. Armstrong Russell C. Beltz
Alexander B. Aronis Frank Belvin
Charles B. Arrington, Jr. Richard G. Bemis
John E. Bendel
Oscar W. Benefiel
Raymond D. Bennett
Joseph E. Bennett
Thomas P. Bennington
Joseph D. Benton
John C. Bergquist
George O. Bernard
John J. Berrier, Jr.
Jesse E. Bethany
Roger G. Betsworth
Thomas A. Bicker-
staff, Jr.
Herbert K. Biegel
John E. Bilderback
Donald J. Bilinski
Clare B. Billing
Robert O. Binkley
Edward E. Birkinshaw,
Jr.
Michael E. Bishop
Robert W. Bjorndahl
Cole Black
Gregory D. Black
George E. Black
Shem K. Blackley, Jr.
Fredrik S. Blackmar
Robert D. Blaine
Peter S. Blair
James S. Blaising
Garvey A. Blanc
James R. Blandford
George F. Blank
Alan A. Blatz

John A. Blesch
Russell M. Blythe
John R. Boardman
H. Lee Boatwright III
Wayne D. Bodenstein-
er
Gill H. Boehringer
Archie M. Bolster
Russell L. Bolton
John J. Bonasia
Clarence G. Bonhan
Edwin J. Bonner
James T. Bonner, Jr.
William W. Bonneville
Philip E. Bonz
Archie D. Borden
Joseph Bordogna
David L. Boslaugh
William L. Boss, Jr.
Edmund B. Bossart,
Jr.
George T. Bostic, Jr.
Kirk L. Bosworth
Bruce E. Bothwell
Frederick R. Bott
Francis T. Boucher
Luk S. Boudreaux III
Byron F. Boudreaux
Donal G. Bourke
Norman M. Bouton
Barry V. Bowen
Thomas E. Bower
Peter P. Bowler
Harry S. Boyd, Jr.
Robert L. Boyd
Robert W. Boyd
Robert L. Brace
Leonard A. Bracken,
Jr.
James R. Bradish
Bedford C. Bradley
Jerald S. Bradshaw
Frederic L. Brady, Jr.
Walter F. Brady, Jr.
John L. Brainerd
Carl T. Braun
John A. Brecheen
Stephen K. Breslaue
Harold L. Bridenstine
David G. Briggs
Donald R. Briggs
Franklin H. Briggs
Carl W. Brockenbauer
Ronald D. Brogden
Edward H. Browder
Charles J. Brown
Dennis R. Brown
Glenn C. Brown
Harold E. Brown
Isom L. Brown
James G. Brown
Leo P. Brown
Robert C. Brown
Thomas N. Brown
Victor A. Brown
William H. Browning
III
James H. Brownlow
Merle W. Brubaker
Joseph D. Brubaker,
Jr.
Gerard P. Brunick
Auda E. Buchanan
Philip N. Buchanan
Harry J. Buck
Robert C. Bueker
Norman S. Bull
Donald D. Bunker
Robert B. Bunn
William J. Burch
Harvey W. Burden
Harold E. Burgess, Jr.
Raymond F. Burke
Richard D. Burke
Thomas J. Burke, Jr.
Donald J. Burkhart
Leonard Burnham
John E. Burroughs
David G. Burton
Frederick D. Butter-
field

Dale E. Buxton
Robert D. Buzzard
James Z. Byers
Joseph L. Byrne
Patrick S. Byrne
John C. Cadoo, Jr.
John E. Cahoon, Jr.
Anthony C. Cajka
Rex S. Caldwell, Jr.
Walter K. Caldwell
John H. Calhoun, Jr.
Robert L. Callahan
Edward P. Cambridge
Jim F. Cameron
Robert W. Cameron
John R. Camp
William S. Campbell
Harry F. Campbell, Jr.
Richard F. Campbell
Richard H. Campbell
William H. Campbell
Thomas P. Cann
John M. Cantey
Elisha B. Caraway, Jr.
Charles N. Caricofe
Oscar B. Carlisle
Dudley L. Carlson
Leland J. Carlson
Frank C. Carlton
Frederick L. Carothers
James M. Carr, Jr.
Patrick F. Carr
Thomas U. Carr
Allan H. Carry
Burton E. Carson II
Powell F. Carter, Jr.
Robert E. Carter
James F. Cartwright
Frederick E. Cart-
wright
Robert L. Carver
Alan F. Casey
John A. Casey
Terry G. Caston
David W. Caswell
William K. Catching,
Jr.
Allen W. Cater
Francis Catterson
William R. Chadwick
Raymond L. Chalker
Dan D. Chandler
Ralph N. Channell
William R. Chapman
Edward A. Chapman,
Jr.
Melvin E. Chapman
Warren P. Chase
Albert K. Chevalier
Thaddeus F. Chiz
Howard E. Christensen
Robert R. Christian
Walter B. Christman
Angelo G. Cicolani
Fred M. Clark
Orris V. Clark
Robert C. Clark
William E. Clause, Jr.
Carroll E. Clausen
Carl C. Clement, Jr.
Gary M. Cleveland
Gene L. Cliff
James G. Cline
Emsley F. Cobb
Stanley H. Cochran
David W. Cockfield
Jonathan S. Coe
Roger L. Coffey
Michael B. Coffey
Jackson Coffin
Theodore L. Coleman,
Jr.
Charles L. Coleman
Rulon F. Collett
Richard T. Colley
Neuland C. Collier
Charles C. Collins, Jr.
Marcellus T. Coltharp
George O. Compton
Richard I. Comstock
Frank C. Conerty

Robert L. Conlan
David J. Conley
Walsh J. Conmy
William C. Connell
Thomas P. Connolly
John J. Connors
Samuel S. Conolly, Jr.
Robert A. Conquest
David R. Conrad
Robert F. Constans
James M. Conway
Charles F. Cook
Stephen N. Cook
Robert H. Cookson
Lynton B. Cooper, Jr.
James A. Cooper
Thomas H. Copeman,
Jr.
Martin F. Corcoran
Don E. Corn
Paul A. Cornett
Joseph A. Corsi
James C. Cotting
Richard H. Coupe
Robert G. Courter
Dwight H. Cox
John E. Craig, Jr.
Lee R. Craig
Robert C. Craig
Richard W. Crain, Jr.
Donald Cranmer
John F. Craven
Edward R. Crawford
Warren H. Crawford
Perry F. Creighton,
Jr.
Tom J. Cress
James A. Crider
Jack L. Crittenden
Richard L. Croll
Wayne R. Crone
Dale F. Crosier
Billy D. Crouch
Robert A. Crozier
Alexander S. Cuenin
III
Daniel M. Culhane
Edward I. Cunning-
ham
Raymond M. Currie
William R. Curtis
Dennis E. Curtis
Paul O. Cutchin
Jerry D. Dage
John Dalota, Jr.
John L. Dampman
Jere R. Daniell II
Alan O. Dann
Rodger L. Darbonne
Ronald Darby
Carl F. Davis, Jr.
Charles N. Davis
Frederick G. Davis
George W. Davis, Jr.
Gregory H. Davis, Jr.
Harry L. Davis
James C. Davis, Jr.
Robert G. Davis
Norman E. Davis
Stanley R. Davis
Thomas A. Davis
Albert L. Dawson
Earl F. Day
James P. Day
John J. Dearly
Victor A. DeCesare
Charles R. Dedrickson
James L. DeGroff
Richard J. Deisher
George B. DeLano
Joseph C. DeLashmitt,
Jr.
James L. Delozier
Lawrence S. DelPlato
Daniel C. Dennison
William A. Deshler
Harry L. Devoe
William L. Devries
Roderick S. Dickens,
Jr.
Carl C. Dietz
Warren C. Dietz

Dan J. DiGiovacchino
Richard H. Dimse
James W. Dingle, Jr.
Max W. Dixon
Sidney C. Dixon
Peter J. Doerr
Jeremy H. Dole
Beal G. Dolven, Jr.
Joseph M. Donahue
Henry S. Donaldson
Bruce K. Donaldson
Ian E. M. Donovan
Robert M. Donovan
James M. Doody, Jr.
Anthony J. Dopazo
William R. Dorow
Gerald P. Dougherty
Gregory P. Dowd
John Downes, Jr.
"J." Patrick Doyle
Michael G. Doyle
Robert C. Doyle
John B. Draves
Loring P. Dresel
John P. Duffy
Leonard G. Duffy
Louie C. Duke
Joseph J. Dunn
Richard E. Dupree
Robert H. Durbin, Jr.
David A. Durgin
Montague R. Duval
John L. Dwyer
George L. Dyer, Jr.
James P. Eadie II
Joseph M. Earley, Jr.
Richard D. Echart
Donald E. Eckels
Walter O. Edberg
James V. Edlmon
Thomas H. Edgerton
Charles T. Edson
Henry F. Edwards
James C. Edwards
William P. Egan
William N. Elder
William Elias, Jr.
Richard C. Eller
Charles P. Elliott
John L. Elliott
Fredrick H. Elliott
Robert C. Ellis
Robert L. Ellison
Harold B. Elsasser
Allen H. Elsea
Stanley W. Elwell
Robert E. Emery
Thomas R. M. Emery
Joseph R. Emmett
Robert J. Englert
Ivan H. Enstrom, Jr.
Calvin C. Epple
Billy M. Eppler
Richard O. Erhardt
Kenneth J. Erickson
Gerald W. Eriksen
Robert B. Erskine
Billy M. Ervin
Charles H. Erwin
Jacob V. Eskenazi
Michael J. Estocin
Gerald R. Etcheson
Edwin Ettinger
Irvin R. Evans
James J. Evans
Richard P. Evans
Samuel D. Evans
William F. Exley
Roger M. Exon
Joseph D. Fairchild
Robert H. Fall III
Allen P. Fancher
Francis J. Farino
Lawrence J. Farrell
David E. Farris
Harold S. Fassett, Jr.
Richard H. Faulkner
Fred A. Feakes
George E. Feakes, Jr.
Joseph H. Fegan
Clarence E. Fend, Jr.
Sam A. Ferguson

Edward S. Ferrell
 Harry H. Ferrier
 George F. Fickeissen
 Harold C. Filbert
 Hulon P. Fillingane
 Edward P. Fillion, Jr.
 Jerome I. Fink
 Walter J. Finke, Jr.
 John G. Finley
 Charles D. Fisher
 John C. Fisher
 Harold W. Fisk
 Edward S. Fitch
 George M. Fitting
 John Fitzgerald
 Vernon H. Fix
 Robert F. Flacke
 Myles E. Fladager
 John E. Flanagan, Jr.
 James T. Fleming, Jr.
 Larry B. Flood
 Walter R. Flowers
 Edward R. Floyd
 Thomas R. Foard
 Harvey D. Foley
 Donald S. Foltz
 Theodore P. Foote
 John J. Foran
 William R. Forbes
 Harold L. Ford
 James N. Ford
 Barton W. Fordham, Jr.
 Frederick F. Fordon
 Ronald Forehand
 Joseph A. Forest
 John G. Forester, Jr.
 Robert R. Fountain, Jr.
 James N. Fowler
 John D. Fowler
 Francis H. Fox
 Mylo G. Fox
 Nigel D. Francis
 Fred R. Frank
 Joe Frank
 David A. Frecker
 Jo W. French
 Henry A. French
 Bruce H. Frisch
 Carl Froid-James
 Richard H. Frye
 Vernon M. Fueston, Jr.
 John A. Fulford
 Gary M. Fuller
 John W. Fuller
 Milo W. Fuller
 S. Pendleton Fullinwider, Jr.
 Charles R. Fullmer
 James R. Funck
 Daniel J. Fuss
 Richard K. Gaines, Jr.
 Thomas E. Gainer
 Joseph E. Galbraith
 John W. Gallagher
 Barry J. Galt
 Barry T. Galvin
 Robert J. Galvin
 Clark M. Gammell
 John R. Ganey
 Geoffrey L. Gardner
 William A. Garland
 Theodore C. Garrett
 Jack A. Garrow
 Robert W. Garver
 Thomas A. Gasser
 Richard L. Gates
 Joseph A. Gattuso
 Leroy F. Gayle
 Richard G. Geer
 Charles F. Gerhan, Jr.
 Richard L. Gero
 Scott Gerrish
 William J. Gerrity
 Henry B. Giedzinski
 Gerald H. Gilbert
 Richard B. Gilchrist
 Charles W. Gilgore
 Russell R. Gill
 Jack W. Gillespie

Jerry T. Gillett
 Kenneth D. Gilmore
 Gerald W. Gilstad
 James G. Givens
 Gerald L. Glahn
 Burton J. Gleason
 Robert W. Goedjen
 Robert B. Goetz
 Milton L. Goff III
 Milford I. Gooden
 Charles L. Gooding, Jr.
 Forrest H. Goodman
 George D. Goodrich
 Ray Goodson
 Andrew J. Goodwin, Jr.
 Rex J. Goodwin
 Perry G. Gorham
 Guy A. B. Grafius
 Bernard B. Gragg, Jr.
 Walter W. Graham III
 Loren R. Graham
 James G. Graham
 Roger L. Graham
 Miles T. Graham
 Edwin H. Grant, Jr.
 Roger B. Granum
 Clifford R. Graue
 Edwin A. Greathouse
 Ellis F. Green
 George W. Greene, Jr.
 Donald L. Greene
 James F. Greene, Jr.
 William T. Greenhalgh, Jr.
 James M. Grego
 Robert J. Griesemer
 James L. Griffin
 Edward P. Griffing
 Laurence H. Grimes, Jr.
 Glenn W. Groenewold
 Charles C. Groff
 Richard L. Grogan
 Donald L. Gross
 Paul B. Grozen
 Aubrey J. Gruber
 Charles D. Grundy
 John W. Grunewald
 Harold B. Grutchfield, Jr.
 Daniel S. Guilday
 Sherred L. Guille
 Gordon R. Guilmond
 Howard P. Gunther
 James C. Gussett
 Byron C. Gwinn II
 Robert C. Haavind
 Michael C. Hadow
 Charles R. Hagee
 Elmer C. Hagen
 Jack Hagen
 Karl H. Hagenau
 John D. Hague
 Frederick W. Hahn, Jr.
 Charles W. Hall
 Edward A. Hall
 Roy V. Hall
 Howard R. Hallett, Jr.
 William O. Hamilton III
 Oscar C. Hamilton, Jr.
 Harry D. Hamilton
 David G. Hamilton
 Robert B. Hamilton
 Frank P. Hamilton
 Rodney E. Hammond
 Robert A. Hampton
 Frederick D. Hamrick
 Norman L. Haney
 Lawrence V. Hansen, Jr.
 Ervin E. Hanson
 Robert P. Hanson
 William E. Happersett, Jr.
 Thad H. Harden
 J. E. Harmon
 Lee D. Harmony, Jr.
 Elwood N. Harper
 Clio A. Harper, Jr.

Norman W. Harper
 Donald K. Harris
 William A. Harris, Jr.
 Kenneth C. Harsh
 John V. Harter
 Richard M. Harvey
 Neil L. Harvey
 George F. Harvie
 Anthony A. Hastoglis
 Frederic H. Hawkins
 William C. Hawley
 Jan R. Hawthorne
 John B. Haynes
 Hugh A. Hazle
 Joseph F. Heaps
 Edmund W. Heath
 Donald F. Hebert
 Donald C. Heckman
 Lawrence L. Heisel
 James E. Hemphill
 Thomas F. Henderson
 Raymond R. Henderson
 Bobby G. Henderson
 George H. Hendricks
 Jack A. Henry
 William R. Henry
 Robert R. Henzler
 Robert W. Hepworth
 Wesley C. Herbol
 Diego E. Hernandez
 Herbert F. Herndon
 James L. Hesburgh
 John L. Heuser
 John A. Hickey
 Clarence A. Hicks, Jr.
 Leo A. Higgins
 Kenneth L. Highfill
 Emerson W. Hilker
 Bruce E. Hill
 James G. Hill
 Richard L. Hill
 Raymond W. Hine
 William G. Hine
 Marion L. Hines
 Carl K. Hinger
 Robert M. Hinton
 Thomas W. Hirtle
 Douglas S. Hobbs
 William L. Hobbs, Jr.
 Sidney N. Hockens
 Ralph L. Hoehne
 Paul M. Hoff, Jr.
 Benjamin E. Hoffman
 George C. Hogan
 Robert L. Hogg
 John C. Holland, Jr.
 John O. Holland
 William J. Holland, Jr.
 Lowell J. Holloway
 James E. Holmes
 Donald L. Holmes
 Hartley O. Holte
 Jackson H. Honeycutt
 George F. Hooper
 Frederick P. Kaempfer
 John J. Hootman
 Harry A. Hoover
 Gordon W. Hope
 Lawrence G. Hoppenjans
 Serge P. Horeff
 Hainyard L. Horne, Jr.
 Douglas C. Hoskins, Jr.
 Chester E. Houston
 Norris W. Howard
 Joe A. Hudson
 Ralph R. Huff
 Harry L. Huggins
 John W. Hughes
 Richard M. Hughes
 Griffith L. Humphrey
 Elmer L. Hunt
 Herman L. Hunt
 James H. Hunt
 John B. Hunt
 Kirby P. Hunt
 Richard L. Hunt
 Charles T. Hunter, Jr.
 Robert M. Hunter
 William B. Huntley, Jr.

Marc A. Hurt
 Tom G. Hussmann
 Willis G. Hyde
 Theodore K. Hyman
 Clifford F. Ide
 Gary D. Irish
 Robert P. Irons, Jr.
 Thomas E. Irvine
 Donald E. Isaacson
 David E. Isselhard
 Clarence D. Ives
 William R. Jackson, Jr.
 Tommy H. Jackson
 Joe T. Jackson, Jr.
 Jimmie D. Jackson
 James H. Jacobsen
 Harry R. James III
 Alexander J. Jansen
 Thomas A. Jansing
 Anthony Janus, Jr.
 Edward F. Jardine, Jr.
 Johns P. Jaudon
 John E. Jedlicka
 Lawrence R. Jefferis
 Gaston J. Jenkins
 John C. Jenkins
 David H. Jenner
 Fred O. H. Jensen
 Harvey J. Jensen
 Paul O. Jessen
 Harvey R. Jewett, Jr.
 Linwood E. Johnson
 Grant R. Johnson
 Bruce Johnson
 Roger D. Johnson
 Lauren A. Johnson
 William T. Johnson
 Earl J. Johnson
 Raymond F. Johnson, Jr.
 George L. Johnson
 Richard W. Johnson
 John R. Johnson
 John A. Johnson
 Max R. Johnson
 Donald L. Johnson
 Edwin C. Johnson
 Fred W. Johnston, Jr.
 Edward A. Johnston
 Gerald L. Jones
 Gary D. Jones
 John L. Jones
 Roycroft C. Jones, Jr.
 Richard M. Jones
 Waldo D. Jones II
 David L. Jordan
 Douglas S. Jordan
 Arliss L. Jordan
 Rudy E. Joyce
 William B. Joyce
 Robert G. Judd
 Bruce C. Juell
 Eugene A. Jumper, Jr.
 Kenneth I. Jurgensen
 Frederick P. Kaempfer
 Donald S. Kaiser
 Richard E. Kameron
 James H. Karker
 Marvin S. Katzman
 Alfred W. Kavanaugh
 Donald Kear
 Leo P. Keating, Jr.
 Ralph H. Keeler
 Delbert V. Keener
 Robert B. Keiser
 Donald W. Kellerman
 Donald R. Kelley
 Donald C. Kelly
 Gerald C. Kelly
 James P. Kelly, Jr.
 Lawrence C. Kelly
 Dale L. Kemmerer
 Wallace C. Kemper, Jr.
 Robert J. Kendra
 Robert P. Kennedy
 Calvin E. Kennedy
 William A. Kennington
 Robert Kerr
 Paul R. Kerrigan

Robert J. Kerrigan
 Leslie P. Kewley
 Roy V. Keyes, Jr.
 Robert C. Keys
 Richard C. Keyser
 Timothy M. Kibler
 Thomas G. Kiefaber
 Burdell E. Kietzmann
 Edgar L. Kilborn
 James M. Kilpatrick
 Ronald K. Kimmell
 James C. Kinard
 Fred N. King
 Edward A. Kingston
 John J. Kingston, Jr.
 Alexander G. Kirby, Jr.
 Harvey R. Kirby
 Theodore A. Kircher
 Clyde K. Kislinsky
 Joseph E. Klein
 Thomas R. Kloves
 Dale R. Klugman
 Donald E. Knepper
 Robert R. Knepper, Jr.
 Stephen H. Knight II
 Larance W. Knoch, Sr.
 Everett F. Knowles
 Ronald S. Knowlton
 Richard J. Koch, Jr.
 Robert L. Koehler
 Frederick H. Koester, Jr.
 Donald A. Kohloff
 Demosthen N. Kolaras
 Stanley D. Kolb, Jr.
 Raymond H. Kornblatt
 John H. Koslov
 Charles G. Kother
 Jerold D. Kowalsky
 Albert J. Kozischek
 George H. Krag
 Harold G. Kraus
 Henry P. Krienke
 Eugene L. Krittler
 John L. Krizek
 Joseph J. Kronzer, Jr.
 Ronald C. Kucera
 William P. Kuhne
 Stanley J. Kuplinski
 Albert J. Lacklen
 Herbert M. Laghut
 Leroy C. Laine
 Clarence R. Lake
 Chapman L. Lam
 Walter W. Lamb
 John P. Lamers
 Frederick W. Lander, Jr.
 Robert W. Lane
 Peter H. Langer
 John P. Larson
 Alvin T. Laughlin
 Gene P. Laughlin
 William F. Lavallee
 David O. Lavallee
 George E. Lawniczak, Jr.
 George B. M. Lawrence, Jr.
 Samuel W. Layn
 William J. Leach
 Kenneth F. Leahy
 John M. Leaver, Jr.
 James B. LeBlanc
 Charles E. LeBoeuf
 William P. Lee
 Robert J. LeFevre
 Edward C. Leibig, Jr.
 John S. Leighton
 John M. Leivestad
 Ronald C. Lengyel
 Richard H. Lennon
 Leonard Leo
 Richard R. Leonard, Jr.
 James E. Lesh
 Robert E. Lester
 John H. LeTarte
 Raymond E. Lett

Gerald Levey
 Irwin B. Levy
 Walter G. Lieberman
 Richard R. Ligon
 Donald H. Lillenthal
 John E. Lilly, Jr.
 Austin M. Lindsey
 Donald B. Linehan
 William L. Lipford
 Donald C. Lipstak
 Richard D. Liptak
 David H. Lively
 William J. Locke
 John V. Lockhart
 John F. Long
 Donald E. Lotton
 John J. Love
 Max H. Love
 Dana E. Lowe
 Clifford A. Lowrey
 Louis A. Loynes
 Daniel B. Lucas, Jr.
 Carl W. Ludvik
 Fred J. Lukomski
 Edward W. Lull
 Eugene P. Lund
 Carl D. Lundin
 Robert H. Lundy
 Randall M. Luzader
 David A. Lyle
 Frank E. Lyle
 James A. Lyons
 William P. Lyons
 Richard J. MacAleer
 Allen McDiarmid
 John W. MacDonald
 David L. Mack
 Henry C. Mack, Jr.
 Joseph P. Mack
 John A. Mack
 Richard N. Mack
 Joseph D. MacKenzie
 Malcolm MacKinnon III
 William E. Madison
 Evan W. Madsen
 Donald C. Magee
 William T. Mahaffey
 Peter D. Maher III
 Arthur O. Maki, Jr.
 Joseph Malec, Jr.
 Richard D. Maltzman
 Charles R. Mandly
 Paul R. Manikowski
 John A. Mann
 James D. Mansfield
 Mike Manso
 Henry J. Manthorpe, Jr.
 Charles R. Marchand
 Louis H. Marcoux
 Lloyd P. Marsh
 Miles E. Marsh
 John Marshall, Jr.
 Donald L. Martin
 David V. Martin
 James A. Martin
 James E. Martin
 George H. Martin
 John A. Martin
 Donald Martin
 George W. Martin
 Harry C. Martin
 Charles E. Masalin
 Stuart J. Mason, Jr.
 Richard L. Mathews
 Carter C. Mathies
 Walter L. Matthes, Jr.
 Mitchell D. Matthews, Jr.
 Rudolph Matzner, Jr.
 Tommy L. Mauer
 James H. Mauldin
 Peter Mayerson
 Peter Maytham
 Stephen J. McArdle, Jr.
 Kenneth R. McCally
 Joseph D. McCann
 William E. McCarron, Jr.

Francis A. McCarthy
Charles J. McCarthy, Jr.
Faber W. McCartney
William F. McCauley
Jack E. McClelland
Kenneth D. McCloskey
John S. McClure
Charles W. McComis
Mark McCormick
Frank R. McCoy, Jr.
Douglas R. McCrimmon
Peter W. McDaniel
John R. McDonnell
Donald A. McGee
William E. McGinnis
Donald E. McGonegal
Donald E. McGrath
Joseph G. McGrath
Edward B. McHale
Alben T. McIsaac
Richard D. McKay
Charles E. McKenna
James D. McKinney
Raymond C. McKinzie
Alfred S. McLaren
John S. McLaughlin
Richard K. McLeod
Edward J. McLyman, Jr.
Peter C. McMahan
John A. McMinn
George J. McMurtry
Richard P. McNeerney
John E. McNish
Robert W. McQuaid
Robert H. McSweeney
Robert P. McVoy
Stuart B. Meach
Jack E. Mead
Robert T. Meloy
Wade I. Melton
Carroll D. Melton
Herbert S. Meltzer
Kenneth J. Mengle
Robert J. Merikangas
Paul R. Merritt
Robert S. Merritt
Ricardo A. Mestres, Jr.
Bertram L. Metzger, Jr.
Benjamin H. Michael
Edward L. Micjan
Jerry T. Middleton
Richard J. Mieldazis
Robert M. Mielich
Walter T. Miesse
Robert N. Miller
Vaden T. Miller
Cardell E. Miller
Ronald A. Miller
Robert W. Miller
Eldon J. Miller
Ronald D. Miller
Justin A. Miller, Jr.
Eric Milnor
Roy C. Milton
Robert T. Minkoff
Donald E. Minnich
George F. Minser
Richard I. Mixon
Matt C. Miekush
Charles R. Mohr
Ronald J. Molloy
Theophilus B. L. Molloy
Henry L. Monroe, Jr.
Dewitt H. Moody
Gene R. Moore
Robert S. Moore
Robert W. Moore
Thomas H. Moore
William H. Moore IV
Thomas J. Moran
Thomas W. Morgan
John R. Morgan
Charles H. Morgan
Thomas J. Morris, Jr.
Robert M. Morrison
Dexter C. Morrison

Robert E. Mortvedt
David P. Moss
John W. Mossbarger
Charles E. Mott
Richard L. Mudgett
Burton L. Munger
Malcolm H. Munsey
James E. Murphey
James F. Murphy
John J. Murphy
Thomas H. Murray, Jr.
John D. Musa
Henry C. Mustin
Charles W. Myer
Joseph E. Myers
Robert U. Myers
Willie R. Myers
James H. Nagel
Ronald E. Narmi
Gary B. Nash
Travis D. Nations
Olen E. Naylor, Jr.
Thomas W. Nedwek
Donald E. Needham
Lowell B. Nelson
Roger E. Nelson, Jr.
Donald L. Nelson
Richard T. Nelson
Robert G. Newbegin
IV
Edward C. Newbegin
Byron B. Newell, Jr.
Charles L. Newman
Jesse S. Newsom, Jr.
Hugh M. Newsom
James H. Newton
Richard L. Nichols
Richard M. Niedbala
George R. Niemela
John L. Niklaus
Robert T. Nixon
Walter E. Nolan, Jr.
James H. Norman
Stuart E. Norris
Henry C. North, Jr.
James Norton
William D. Noteboom
George H. Nourse
Keith A. Nyhus
John W. Nyquist
Winslow B. Oakes
Carl E. Oates
William J. Oberle
Charles M. O'Brien, Jr.
John D. O'Brien, Jr.
William O'Brien III
Patrick J. O'Donnell
John L. O'Donnell
Edward W. Oehlbeck
Jack A. Offins
Edward G. Ogden
James M. O'Hara
Richard E. O'Leary
Chauncey G. Olinger, Jr.
Charles P. Oliver
Stanley E. Olmstead
Walter E. Olsen
Gary E. Olson
Ross S. Olson
John C. O'Meara
Gordon B. Orbesen
Harold N. Osborn
Lloyd C. Osborn
Ross G. Ostlund
Walter D. J. O'Toole
Albert F. Ott
William A. Overbay
John L. Overbey
William R. Overdorff
William J. Overman, Jr.
Curt L. Owen
Daniel I. Padberg
Jerry C. Padrta
Philip M. Palmer
Donald E. Palmer
Thomas W. Parent
John T. Parker, Jr.
Elton C. Parker, Jr.
Frank Parker

Donald H. Parkinson
Frank Parra
Jerry A. Parsons
Harry W. Patch, Jr.
Joel D. Patterson
Roy C. Paul
Donald C. Paulson
Ronald G. Payne
Thomas G. Payne
William L. Payne
David M. Paynter
James A. Pearson
Daniel E. Peckham
Edward M. Peebles
John M. Peeples, Jr.
William B. Peirce
John J. Pepas
Joseph F. Perez
Franklin H. Perry
Gary B. Perry
Phil M. Perry
Raymond Perry
Francis V. Presenti
Richard A. Peters
Vernon W. Peters
Kenneth R. Peterson
Brock A. Peterson
Richard A. Peterson
Fred C. Peterson
Vernon E. Petranek
Gordon L. Petri
Dale B. Petty
Phillip A. Petty
Norman S. Phillips
Charles W. Phillips
Lovett B. Pickren
Blake H. Pielstick
John T. Pierce
William H. Pierce
Joseph L. Pierce, Jr.
Robert E. Piper, Jr.
Robert B. Pirie, Jr.
Anthony J. Pitz
Bruce W. Platz
Wayne G. Plazak
Charles M. Plumly
Richard K. Plummer
Alfred L. Poe, Jr.
Marvin S. Poissot
Robert K. Pollak
William A. Pollard
Eugene L. Pollmann
Glen W. Poore
Edwin D. Porter
Allan A. Porter
James E. Poth
Eric D. Potter
Willis F. Potter
Thomas B. Potter, Jr.
John H. Powell
Edward F. Powers, Jr.
John B. Powers
Maurice T. Pozzi, Jr.
Keith F. Prater
Loren M. Pratt
William L. Pray
Gordon R. Prentice
George B. Pressly
John V. Prestia
Alan H. Price
Alan E. Price
Neil S. Pruden
Willie B. Pruitt
William N. Pugliese
James L. Purdy
Sylvester A. Puzio
William J. Quinn
William L. Ragsdale
Robert L. Rain
Richard L. Ralston
Ross Rammelmeyer
Charles F. Ramsey
Lloyd W. Rasmussen
William E. Ratliff
James E. Rattan
Leonard M. Rausch
Paul E. Raysin
Kenneth F. Read
Kenneth R. Rebello
Calvin C. Reed
Richard L. Reed

William C. Reed
John G. Reeder
David A. Reedy
John N. Rees
Malcolm C. Rees, Jr.
Gerald E. Reid
Warren E. Reid
Phillip J. Reilly, Jr.
Thomas L. Reise
Phillip M. Reitzel
John W. Renard
William O. K. Rentz
Stephen W. Reszetar
David B. Reynolds
Preston A. Reynolds
Keith A. Reynolds
William K. Rhodes, Jr.
Eugene M. Rice
Keith J. Rice
Robert V. Rice
Robert C. Rice
Peter H. Rich
Bill A. Richards
Bruce Richards
John R. Richards
Gordon R. Richards
William G. Richardson
Frederick J. Richey
Frederick W. Richter
Huntley N. Ricker
Myron V. Ricketts
George E. Riddell
George M. Rider
Ronald E. Ries
Ivers W. Riley, Jr.
Thomas R. Riley, Jr.
Ira D. Riskin
Todd D. Ritter
James D. Rivers
James P. Riviere
Harold S. Roach, Jr.
John W. Roberts
Lloyd C. Roberts
John L. Robertson
Joel A. Robinson
Robert M. Robinson
Clifford V. Robinson
William A. Rockwell
Ray W. Rodman
John E. Roe, Jr.
William F. Roemer
Charles L. Rogers
Thomas F. Rogers
Brien B. Rogers
Eugene Rogers
James L. Rollins
Everet F. Rollins, Jr.
Robert W. Rose
Russell L. Rose
Hayden A. Rossclunis, Jr.
Mario A. Rossi
Ralph A. Rossi
James F. Roth
James A. Roth
James C. Rothrock
Alvin A. Rouchon
Kirk W. Rowe
Robert R. Rule
William H. Rush
Franklin E. Russell
John W. Rustin, Jr.
Marvin L. Salomon
Chester G. Sample
Charles R. Samuelson
William A. Sanders
Carl H. Sanders, Jr.
James D. Sanders
Thomas E. Sandmeyer
George S. Sanstol
John D. Santivasci
Gerald L. Sauer
Robert C. Saunders IV
Wesley W. Saunders
Wesley L. Saunders, Jr.
Arthur L. Schelling
David E. Scherer
Francis H. Scherer
Edward R. Schickler
John F. Schilpp
John R. Schinabeck

Robert K. Schleichardt
Joseph R. Schlichter
Edward A. Schmidt
Fred B. Schoenberger
Harry C. Schrader, Jr.
Gilbert A. Schroeder
Albert B. Schultz
Thomas D. Schultz
Walter H. Schulze II
Gary B. Schumacher
Charles F. Schwabe
Robert J. Schwartz
Carl E. Schwarz
Albert J. Scoles
Austin B. Scott, Jr.
Augustus E. Scott, Jr.
Gary L. Scott
George W. Scott
MacGregor G. Scott
Ronald D. Scott
William D. Scott
Norris L. Seabron
Charles E. Seager
Murland W. Searight
James H. Seaton
Robert B. Segal
Richard A. Semmler
Floyd B. Shacklock
William F. Shand
Robert J. Shanley
John W. Shearin
John P. Sheehy
Charles B. Sheldon
Donald C. Shelton
Rolf A. Shepard
John R. Sherman
Lawrence L. Sherman
Dan G. Shields
Thomas Shine, Jr.
John H. Shippee
Richard L. Shoup
William H. Showers
John Shulick, Jr.
Harry E. Shull
James W. Shumate
Gordon B. Shupe
Winfield M. Sides, Jr.
Gilbert K. Slevers
Robert G. Sievert
Arie C. A. Sigmond
Erwin Sigrist
Gordon F. Siljestrom
John R. Sill
Larry K. Simmering
Roger O. Simon
George E. Sineath
Charles V. D. Singer, Jr.
Ray D. Sipes
Melvin J. Sires III
Arthur R. Skelly
Wallace A. Skelton
Stanley S. Skorupski, Jr.
Robert W. Skyles
Marshall T. Slayton
Harold D. Sleet
Kenneth J. Sliwa
Barton L. Smith
Charles E. Smith, Jr.
Charles L. Smith
Charles R. Smith
Charles G. Smith
Dickinson M. Smith
Douglas A. Smith
Darrel Smith
Donald A. Smith
Edward G. Smith
John W. Smith
Kenneth E. Smith
Lewis D. Smith
Marvin G. Smith
Neil C. Smith
Roy J. Smith
Ralph A. Smith III
Robert L. Smith
Robert W. Smith
Thomas K. Smith
Thomas R. Smith
William D. Smith
Winchester C. Smith, Jr.

Dimitry Smorsch
James R. Snow
Gary L. Snyder
William J. Sommer-ville, Jr.
Manuel B. Sousa, Jr.
Jack F. Sousa
Charles M. Southall
David F. Southard
Stephen E. Speltz
Harry E. Spence
Walton R. Spencer
Thomas J. Spisak
Norman L. Spry
James A. Stackpole
John H. Staehle
Dudley V. Staggs, Jr.
Thomas F. Stallman
Franklin R. Standerfer
Arthur W. Standley, Jr.
Herbert L. Stanley
Paul R. Steffenhagen
Frederick B. Steketee
David M. Stembel, Jr.
Edward V. Stephenson
Gordon L. Stephens
Francis L. Stephens
James R. Stevens
William Stevens
Robert N. Stewart
John E. Stewart
Frederick R. Stewart, Jr.
Walter J. Stewart III
Ronald L. Stoddart
Walter W. Stoepel-
werth
Francis G. Stokes
Bernard J. Stortecky
Peter R. Story
George W. Stott, Jr.
Leland R. Stouter
John T. Strain
Ralph N. Straley II
Carl J. Strang, Jr.
Robert C. Strange
Raymond S. Strang-
ways
Richard A. Stratton
William R. Stratton
John B. Streitt
Willard C. Striffler, Jr.
Thomas L. Strub
Douglas M. Stuart
Donald B. Stuart
Charles J. Stuart, Jr.
Richard W. Stuebben, Jr.
Harley L. Stuntz III
Walter Sturm
Donald L. Sturtz
Dennis J. Sullivan, Jr.
John J. Sullivan
Florence M. Sullivan
Donald M. Sumner
Kenneth F. Sumner
Ronald K. Sundfors
Paul E. Sutherland, Jr.
Wilber B. Swalm
William A. Sybers
Charles T. Sylvester
William G. A. Symp-
son, Jr.
Edward B. Talbot
John M. Tallman
Thadeus Tarka
Charles A. Tarver, Jr.
James E. Tassell
Carl H. Taylor, Jr.
Alex O. Taylor, Jr.
Patterson C. Taylor
John E. Taylor
Raymond P. Tennison
Domenic S. Terranova
Horace J. Terrill III
Henry L. Thacker, Jr.
William J. "hearle
Colin C. Thomas
William I. Thomas
Emil S. Thompson, Jr.
Richard E. Thompson

Harry E. Thompson
Ernest T. Thompson
William Q. Thornburg
John R. Thune
John C. Tibbs
George D. Tice, Jr.
Frederick W. Tindall
Donald G. Todaro
James F. Todd
Robert E. Tollaksen
Albert L. Toney, Jr.
Ernest J. Toupin, Jr.
Donald J. Toutant
George F. Towne III
Bernard J. Tracey
William K. Tracy
Jeffrey W. Traenkle
Clifford D. Treese
Wallace E. Trelford
Delmer Trimble
Dean E. Troxell II
Ernest W. Truman, Jr.
Arnold L. Trygland
George Tsantes, Jr.
James R. Tucker
James W. Tucker
John E. Tucker
William R. Tully, Jr.
John L. Turnbull III
Laurence L. Turner
Lee R. Turner, Jr.
Edmund L. Turner
Joseph F. Turpel
Gordon F. Udall, Jr.
Louis D. Uht
Donald M. Ulbrich
Simon J. Ulickas, Jr.
Robert W. Ullman
George E. Ulrich
John H. Ulrich
Fred S. Underwood
Walter G. Updike
Robert E. VanDermay
Richard W. VanHorn
David B. VanHulsteyn
Loring E. VanKleeck
William E. Vanoy
Richard W. VanPelt
James A.
VanValkenburg
John M. Vaughan
Eugene H. Vaughan, Jr.
Gordon G. Vaughan
Gerald C. Vaught
Raymond C. Vehorn
Carl Versteeg
Grant J. Villemaire, Jr.
Howard E. Vinson
Robert J. Vogel
George H. Volk
Seaborn H. Wade, Jr.
Donald L. Waggoner
Harry A. Wagner
Denis E. Waitley
William A. Walden
Robert P. Waldron
Michael J. Waldron
Clyde E. Waldrop
Benny R. Walker
James R. Walker
Eugene R. Walker
John A. Walker, Jr.
John D. Wallace
Kenneth T. Wallenius
Homer M. Wallin, Jr.
Lawrence P. Walsh
William A. Walsh
Donald W. Walter
John T. Walter, Jr.
Joseph J. Walter
Peter E. Walther
Thomas G. Warburton
Edward A. Wardwell
Larry E. Ware
Byron L. Warmee
John S. Warner
James F. Warnke
Frank B. Warren
Richard P. Warrick

Ronald R. Warthen
Jerome F. Watson
John Watson
Harry C. Watts
Raymond A. Ways
Richard J. Wear
Terry M. Weathers
Wayne R.
Weatherhead
John C. Weaver
Richard M. Weber
Hugh L. Webster
James G. Webster
Donald P. Wefer
Raymond L. Wehrmeister
Morton E. Weichsel, Jr.
Calvin M. Weil
Richard M. Weinfield
Richard L. Weis
James R. Weller
Alfred H. Wells, Jr.
John E. Wengert
John W. Werblow
Rodney K. Wernicke
Rene D. Wernicke
Donald A. West
Kenneth W. Westall
Darr E. Westbrook, Jr.
Bernard A. White
Billy J. White
Harold O. White
Kohen E. White
Marvin L. White
Trentwell M. White, Jr.
Ted E. Whiting
Frank C. Whitney
Ralph C. Wiggins, Jr.
William W. Wigley
Lawrence S. Wigley
John E. Wild
Edward A. Wilkinson, Jr.
Bruce S. Wilkinson
Charles H. Will, Jr.
Mark R. Willcott III
Frederick D. Williams
Hugh C. Williams
John O. Williams, Jr.
Percy W. Williams, Jr.
Talmage T. Williams, Jr.
Tommy L. Williams
Gerald G. Williams
Arthur G. Williams
David E. Williams
Joseph F. Williams
John P. Williamson, Jr.
Edmund P. Willis
James L. Willis, Jr.
Allen D. Wills, Jr.
Robert H. Williard
William R. Wilson
Derek W. Wilson
Wayne W. Wilson
Gordon B. Wilson
John R. Wilson, Jr.
Victor L. Wilson
Peter D. Wilson
Gunnar F. Wilster
Warren H. Winchester
Paul M. Windham
Richard N. Winfield
Cleon W. Winslow
Carroll H. J. Wittner
Daniel J. Wolkensdorfer
Albert A. Wood, Jr.
Gerard E. Woodbury
James H. Woodson
Thomas A. Woodward
Robert M. Woolnough
Douglas A. Worth
Eric R. A. Woxvold
Theodore H. Wuertel
Joseph E. Wyatt
Donald G. Wylie
Robert F. Wyvill
Willard B. York

Lawrence L. Yost
Clinton H. Young
Leonard R. Young
Richard A. Young
John M. Yuscavage
Charles J. Zadd
Charles E. Zamzow
Marshall V. Zinner
Otto A. Zipf
Emil J. Zselezky
Robert H. Zuege
Allen D. Zumbunnen
Richard F. Zwetsch
Carol Y. Allen
Kathleen A. Bashe

Samuel B. Allen, Jr.
Elif A. Andersen
William N. Ashbey
James F. Babcock
Joseph H. Bacheller
Robert A. Barbary
Jack R. Bedenbaugh
Arthur G. Bedford
John A. Begley, Jr.
Delbert H. Beumer
James F. Blake, Jr.
Arthur F. Braun
William R. Britton
George E. Brockett
George W. Brockman III

Donovan W. Butler
Verner R. Carlson
Edgar S. Causbie
David B. Chaffe III
Brian Chrisman
Robert W. Clamp
Davis L. Clark
William G. Collier
Roy E. Collins
James P. Conway
Wayne T. Cooke
Fred S. Coombs
Robert W. Davis
William W. Deacon
James J. Devenney
Roger F. Dickinson
Ronald W. Dickson
Donald N. Dirks
Robert H. Dolloff
Jerry B. Douglass
Richard M. Dowling
Regis G. Dugue
James L. Durham
George D. Eagleton
Richard W. Ellis
Robert A. Ely
Barry M. Erickson
Sidney A. Farha
Edmond R. Farrell, Jr.
John J. Flynn, Jr.
Phillip W. Flynn
William S. Ford, Jr.
Clarence P. Foreman, Jr.
Ronald N. Friedrich
Laurence W. Frost
Glenn L. Gaddis
Robert F. Gallagher
James H. Gallagher
Harry R. Garing
James E. Gast
William L. Gilbertson
Peter E. Gilles
John C. Grant
Roger A. Graul
John F. Hamilton
James W. Hamilton
Harlan L. Hauskins
Lester D. Hayes, Jr.
Hugh C. Haynsworth III
James D. Hennes
Richard C. Henseler
James R. Holder
Jay S. Horton
Philip L. Hummer
Donald G. Jackson

SUPPLY CORPS

Hildegard K. Baumbach
Marjorie L. Bennett
Sara P. Denby
Beverly W. Frost
Anne V. Goodwin
Elizabeth L. Gregg
Beverly I. Hill
Lucille R. Kuhn
Dorothy A. Larsen
Janice R. McMorro
Shirley A. Staub
Wylene S. Thomas
Anne M. Tierney
Lucy E. Zierdt

Gerald E. Jackson
Samuel Jacobson
William E. Jerauld
James B. Johnson, Jr.
Bobby J. Jones
John M. Jones, Jr.
Robert A. Kaiser
John R. Kaufman
Donald M. Keller
Richard T. Knock
Raymond A. Kruithof
Richard O. Lay
John C. Layman
Charles W. Lee
Stanley S. Leese
Paul A. Lemma
Richard D. Lewis
Thomas G. Lilly
William J. Lockhart
James B. Lovelace, Jr.
Donald A. Lovelace
Jerry B. Maney
Eugene T. Manley
Ray A. Mara
Richard B. Marx
John T. McCahon
Richard B. McLaughlin

Billy G. McSwain
George W. Mead III
Arthur J. Mehrens, Jr.
Douglas M. Michelsen
David O. Miller
Albert G. Moe
Joseph C. Mullins
Charles C. Narducci, Jr.
Alvin W. Neely, Jr.
James R. Ocheltree
Richard S. Olinger
James R. O'Neill
Earl H. Pace
James O. Perkins
Joel S. Poorman
Jack A. Pore
William M. Powell
Farrell J. Rader
George W. Regan
Michael C. Reu
Richard H. Ribbe
Philip W. Richardson
Leonard P. Rittenberg
James M. Robbins
Francis C. Rose, Jr.
Edward F. Ruess II
Richard A. Ruth IV
Stephen R. Ruth
Robert D. Ryder
Guy M. Schaefer
John W. Schmucker
Leon J. Scott, Jr.
William D. Shadelow
George H. Shelton
Carl Shumaker
David A. Singer
Bernard J. Sloan, Jr.
Tex R. Sluder
Gad C. Smith
Jack L. Smith
Ludwig A. Smith, Jr.
Casimir E. Sojka
William P. Sovey
Robert L. Stark

Will G. Steadman III
Dennis R. Stephens
James L. Stidham
Andrew M. Stiglitz
William E. Stombaugh
Donald G. Straw
Patrick D. Sullivan
James W. Sweeney
Robert R. Taylor
Garnot H. Thomas, Jr.
Jennings J. Thompson, Jr.
Clarence J. Thurston
Ronald N. Tokay
William P. Tuggle III
William E. Turcotte
Frank S. Virden
Carl P. Vogel, Jr.
Robert B. Vollum
Carl R. Webb, Jr.
Hoyt T. Webb
Jimmy D. Webb
Herbert S. Weil, Jr.
John E. Wildman
John R. Wilkins
Harold H. Willenborg

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Hyneman M. Address
William A. Bair
Ellis G. Bauereis
Cornelius P. Brogan
George H. Brown
William E. Burdick
Jerry L. Clark
Donald L. Conner
Walton J. Grinke
Aaron B. Jacobs
Robert L. Kramer
Stephen D. Lowe
Neil L. MacFarlane
William J. McCorkle
William J. Mebes

Russell Myers, Jr.
Kenneth R. Newcomb
Philip Oliver, Jr.
Robert P. Phenix
Lowell H. Ruff, Jr.
Willard G. Shafer
Vincent M. Skrinak
Ernest H. Smith
Gene S. Taglienti
Thomas N. Tate
Charles B. Uber
John M. Weis
Robert J. Westberg
Murray L. Brooks
William F. Monnier

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Dale H. Adams
Don E. Auten
Horace W. Baker
Henry J. Bartol
Francis B. Campanella
Alan J. Dean
Charles H. Dennis
Robert A. Ferguson
Bron D. Hafner
George R. Horne II
Clarence D. Lindseth
Fredric W. Maley
Warren L. Martin
Charles P. Mead, Jr.

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James H. R. Cud
Bennett R. Dean
Philip E. Norman

The following named (Naval Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to

the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard H. Alexander	Kenneth A. McNutt
Anthony A. Anthony	Henry N. Means III
William D. Bauer	Anthony D. Miller
Bruce B. Boman	Miles E. Mixson
Richard L. Brinegar	William A. Mooney
Edward R. Browne	Charles H. Nichols, Jr.
John P. Burke	Reid H. Olson
Richard H. Buss	Reid B. Paige
John J. Carty	Wesley R. Phenegar, Jr.
Russell J. Caswell	Larry J. Polk
John C. Chambliss	Thomas M. Pratt III
Matthew T. Cooper	Eugene T. Radcliffe
Dennis M. Cunningham	John R. Rasavage
James E. Dalberg	Thomas L. Reeves
Bernard C. Day	John C. Robertson
Gene A. Deegan	Donald M. Robinson
Eugene J. Driscoll, Jr.	William O. Rodewald
Robert K. Featherston	Joseph F. Rosenberg
William B. Fredricks	Anthony R. Russo
Alan S. Friedland	Michael D. Salmon
George F. Gallagher, Jr.	Kennell I. Schenck, Jr.
Marvin A. Goldberg	John E. Schmidt
Richard H. Gordon	David K. Shroyer, Jr.
Michael J. Hanley	William T. Sinnott
Hugh J. Harper	Douglas K. Stewart
John W. Hemingway	Anthony W. Stremic
Jacob E. Iles	Edward A. Studer
Myron J. Kandra	Paul T. Sudmeyer
Ernest T. Kretschmar	Amos D. Thompson, Jr.
John D. Lanigan	Alan Tinker
Richard C. Lawe	John H. Van Niman
Daniel F. Leary III	Warren S. Walters
George T. Lengauer, Jr.	Paul E. Westphal, Jr.
Alexander P. Longdon, Jr.	David A. Wier
Charles H. Manazir	John M. Willmarth
	Ronald W. Wright

The following-named meritorious non-commissioned officer for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert A. Sutton

The following-named (Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John R. Murphy	Ronald Smaldone
Giles C. Sydnor	James T. Vaughan
William A. Fuller, Jr.	

The following officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Stephen A. Armstrong
Donald C. Bickel
David S. Holben

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 30, 1958:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Walter R. Schreiber, of Maryland, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission, term expiring June 16, 1964.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Frank W. Hull, of Washington, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 30, with headquarters at Seattle, Wash.

James L. Latimer, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 21, with headquarters at Port Arthur, Tex.

Douglas Butler, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Fred Elledge, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee, term of 4 years.

IN THE ARMY

The nomination of Lt. Gen. Lemuel Mathewson, O14980, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962.

The nomination of Maj. Gen. Thomas Leonard Harrold, O16051, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in the rank of lieutenant general.

The nomination of James Alward Van Fleet, O3847, for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of major general, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

The nomination of James Alward Van Fleet, O3847, for advancement on the retired list in the grade of general, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962.

The nominations of Frank O. Alexander, and 1,229 other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army which were received by the Senate on April 14, 1958, and may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Frank O. Alexander which is shown on page 6312, and ending with the name of Ernest D. Zottola, which appears on page 6316.

IN THE NAVY AND IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Byron R. Adams, and 1,806 other officers, for appointment in the Navy and in the Marine Corps, were received by the Senate on March 31, 1958, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Byron R. Adams, which is shown on page 5810, and ending with the name of William W. Heath, which appears on page 5814.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

I Corinthians 10: 24: Let no man seek his own, but everyone another's welfare.

Eternal and ever-blessed God, we are again gathering under the canopy of Thy grace and goodness, coming unto Thee with our prayers of confession, of thanksgiving, of supplication, and of intercession.

Deliver us from the fears that eclipse and weaken our faith, the errors which blind and obscure our vision, and the doubts which deplete and dwarf our energies.

Grant that daily we may be inspired with a deep longing to understand the will and ways of God. Help us to live spiritually and think scientifically, uniting the old values of the spirit with a new vision of the universe and its laws.

Fill us also with a greater sense of social obligation and responsibility, and may we feel more keenly that none liveth

unto himself, but that humanity is one in need and nature and destiny.

Hear us for the sake of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 11470. An act to adjust the method of computing basic pay for officers and enlisted members of the uniformed services, to provide proficiency pay for enlisted members thereof, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. BARRETT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJUSTING BASIC PAY OF UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 11470, to adjust the method of computing basic pay for officers and enlisted members of the uniformed services, to provide proficiency pay for enlisted members thereof, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KILDAY, RIVERS, HEBERT, HARDY, GAVIN, PATTERSON, and BATES.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEES TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may sit during general debate in the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate in the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for the remainder of the week the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration may sit during general debate in the House.